United Nations S/PV.6153

Security Council

Sixty-fourth year

Provisional

6153rd meeting

Monday, 29 June 2009, 10 a.m.

New York

President:	Mr. İlkin	(Turkey)
Members:	Austria	Mr. Mayr-Harting
	Burkina Faso	Mr. Kafando
	China	Mr. Liu Zhenmin
	Costa Rica	Mr. Guillermet
	Croatia	Mr. Vilović
	France	Mr. Ripert
	Japan	Mr. Okuda
	Libyan Arab Jamahiriya	Mr. Dabbashi
	Mexico	Mr. Heller
	Russian Federation	Mr. Dolgov
	Uganda	Mr. Rugunda
	United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland	Sir John Sawers
	United States of America	Ms. Rice
	Viet Nam	Mr. Hoang Chi Trung

Agenda

United Nations peacekeeping operations

This record contains the text of speeches delivered in English and of the interpretation of speeches delivered in the other languages. The final text will be printed in the *Official Records of the Security Council*. Corrections should be submitted to the original languages only. They should be incorporated in a copy of the record and sent under the signature of a member of the delegation concerned to the Chief of the Verbatim Reporting Service, room C-154A.

09-38504 (E)

Please recycle

The meeting was called to order at 10.10 a.m.

Adoption of the agenda

The agenda was adopted.

United Nations peacekeeping operations

The President: In accordance with the understanding reached in the Council's prior consultations, I shall take it that the Security Council agrees to extend invitations under rule 37 of its provisional rules of procedure to Bangladesh, Brazil, Canada, the Czech Republic, Egypt, Germany, Ghana, India, Italy, Jordan, Morocco, Nepal, Nigeria, Pakistan, the Republic of Korea, Rwanda, Spain and Uruguay.

There being no objection, it is so decided.

At the invitation of the President, the representatives of the aforementioned countries took the seats reserved for them at the side of the Council Chamber.

The President: In accordance with the understanding reached in the Council's prior consultations, I shall take it that the Security Council agrees to extend an invitation under rule 39 of its provisional rules of procedure to Mrs. Alice Aghenebit Mungwa, Senior Political Affairs Adviser, Office of the Permanent Observer of the African Union to the United Nations.

It is so decided.

I invite Mrs. Mungwa to take the seat reserved for her at the side of the Council Chamber.

In accordance with the understanding reached in the Council's prior consultations, I shall take it that the Security Council agrees to extend invitations under rule 39 of its provisional rules of procedure to Mr. Alain Le Roy, Under-Secretary-General for Peacekeeping Operations, and Ms. Susana Malcorra, Under-Secretary-General for Field Support.

It is so decided.

The Security Council will now begin its consideration of the item on its agenda. The Council is meeting in accordance with the understanding reached in its prior consultations.

At this meeting, the Council will hear briefings by Mr. Alain Le Roy, Under-Secretary-General for Peacekeeping Operations, and Ms. Susana Malcorra, Under-Secretary-General for Field Support. Before giving them the floor, I would like to make a statement by way of introduction.

Let me first answer the question of why we asked for such a debate in an already busy month for the Security Council. In fact, we tried to do that in our concept note circulated two weeks ago. There, we highlighted the importance of maintaining the effectiveness of United Nations peacekeeping operations as a key tool of United Nations peace efforts and the ongoing reform efforts to overcome the challenges facing it.

In the process of reform of the United Nations peacekeeping mechanism, numerous questions emerge that require the active engagement of and response from the States Members of the United Nations and from the Security Council. Thus, the strengthening of interaction between those who plan and mandate the United Nations peacekeeping operations and those who implement these mandates on the ground, often at considerable risks, is one important aspect that calls for further deliberation by the Council.

In our concept note, we have already touched upon questions relevant to that aspect. We believe that we can find the right answers to these questions only through mutual, transparent and interactive dialogue. In fact, today's meeting aims precisely at that achieving that purpose. We are so pleased that the representatives of major troop-, police- and financing-contributing countries are also with us today, participating in the debate.

As the Council knows, there is already a lively debate taking place in different forums within the United Nations, such as the Committee of Thirty-Four — the Special Committee on Peacekeeping Operations and the Security Council Working Group on Peacekeeping Operations. There are also several initiatives that have been launched by Member States with a view to further strengthening United Nations peacekeeping to meet the needs that arise from the contemporary challenges, such as the United Kingdom/France joint initiative and the initiative of Canada and the Center on International Cooperation.

On the Secretariat side, the Department of Peacekeeping Operations and the Department of Field Support have launched an internal review of the full range of issues confronting the peacekeeping agenda, under the name New Horizon, on which I am sure the

Under-Secretaries-General Mr. Alain Le Roy and Ms. Susan Malcorra will brief us.

What we aim to do today is to continue and contribute to the ongoing discussions on United Nations peacekeeping by inserting new ideas and highlighting some existing issues and thus to contribute to the efforts under way in various forums. We are hoping that the views expressed today by some of the major stakeholders in the realm of peacekeeping will present useful inputs to the ongoing debate in other forums, particularly for the Secretariat in the finalization of the New Horizon paper.

Now, without any further ado, let me open the floor for what we hope will be a lively and fruitful exchange.

I now give the floor to Mr. Le Roy.

Mr. Le Roy (*spoke in French*): First of all, I would like to thank the Turkish presidency of the Security Council for allowing what is for me a very welcome debate on peacekeeping. This meeting follows on the discussions on peacekeeping that were launched earlier this year during the French presidency of the Council. Indeed, I would like to thank all the Member States that have pursued discussions on peacekeeping in different forums in recent months. It is proof that we have a shared interest in supporting United Nations peacekeeping to meet current demands, build on its strengths, address its weaknesses and, finally, prepare for the challenges of the future.

The theme of today's meeting — the relationship between the Security Council and the troop- and police-contributing countries— reflects the fact that United Nations peacekeeping is a global partnership. It brings together the Council, with its legal and political authority, and the Member States, which are the only parties with the means to provide operations with the personnel, materiel and finances they need. It also draws together the Secretariat, which must plan and manage the operations as the entity responsible for their professionalism and efficiency, and the leaders and people of host countries, whose ongoing commitment to peace is perhaps the single most important factor for the success of peacekeeping. And lastly, this partnership draws together the United Nations as a whole with the broad range of regional and multilateral organizations that work alongside us to address conflict and build peace around the world.

Each one of the partners brings a vital contribution to peacekeeping. Each depends on the other. Together, this partnership gives United Nations peacekeeping its strengths of legitimacy, burden-sharing and adaptability. When all the partners are strongly united behind a peacekeeping operation, they send an unequivocal signal of international commitment that reinforces the authority of the Security Council and the credibility and effectiveness of each individual operation.

And of course, if one element of the partnership is weak, the whole project is weakened. Therefore, efforts to strengthen peacekeeping must be comprehensive. For example, we cannot focus on the military elements that provide security, without considering the equally the civilian elements, which support the troops. We cannot promote new policing concepts, such as the formed police units, without an ongoing dialogue with contributing countries as to the tasks expected and the standards linked to them. There are critical connections between mandates, planning, budgets and force generation, which are addressed in different forums of the United Nations. Commitments in one forum need to be translated into resources in others, as well as support on the ground.

This interdependency means that we need strong frameworks for dialogue in order to reach a shared assessment of the challenges as well as the potential for peacekeeping. That was perhaps the most valuable contribution of the Brahimi report (S/2000/809) almost 10 years ago. That report made it possible to build a consensus on the nature and direction of peacekeeping and to put it on a new and firmer footing. As the Council knows, peacekeeping involves 115,000 peacekeepers, or some five times as many since the time of the Brahimi report. We think it is time today to take stock together and to ensure that the partnership is ready for the new challenges we will have to face.

Mandates, as Council members know, are more complex than ever, and there remains a lack of consensus on how certain mandate tasks should be fulfilled. Political differences exist as to the overall goals and direction of a number of missions, and limited consent from key parties hampers a number of our missions. Needed capabilities, such as those well-known helicopters, are not always available in sufficient quantity to the United Nations, considerably hindering mandate implementation in certain missions. Our logistical and administrative systems are

overstretched by the scale and tempo of operations on some of the world's most difficult terrain. And overarching all of that is the reality that in the current global environment, financial constraints press us to review the basic models of peacekeeping. Costs, troop numbers and capability requirements cannot all continue to rise indefinitely.

Unfortunately, there is little sign that peacekeeping demand is decreasing. On the contrary, factors such as environmental changes, economic shocks, transborder organized crime and extremism may well contribute to political and security instability and lead to new demands for peacekeepers. That means the peacekeeping partnership has to be broad and strong — in terms of the participants and their contributions, as well as in terms of consensus and unity on goals and actions. This also means that the full spectrum of tools and responses besides peacekeeping must be available to the international community, including conflict prevention, mediation and multinational force deployments.

(*spoke in English*)

The Department of Peacekeeping Operations/Department of Field Support (DPKO/DFS) New Horizon initiative is our contribution to forming a new partnership agenda for peacekeeping. The Council has already received an executive brief of a non-paper which will be released in July. The brief contains the main themes we are reflecting upon and the areas in which we will propose some recommended follow-up actions. I should stress that we consider that we are at the start of a process of discussion with the Council. We would see a need to follow up with an intensified in-depth dialogue on thematic issues both in New York and outside. Many of the issues before us are not new. The objective is to arrive at a set of achievable immediate, medium- and long-term goals to help configure United Nations peacekeeping to better meet today's and tomorrow's challenges.

With that in mind, the non-paper will focus on four main points: first, critical peacekeeping tasks and functions that require a renewed consensus; secondly, measures to improve mission design, resourcing and deployment; thirdly, proposals on assessing and building the capacities needed for future peacekeeping; and fourthly, a strategy to create a stronger, more flexible support system.

I will not go through all the proposals we make in each area, since the brief is before the Council. I would rather wish to focus my remarks on a few of the issues which, on the basis of my first year in charge of DPKO, I think are top priorities.

With regard to the first key area, we would argue that there is a need for clearer consensus on the role of peacekeepers in delivering, for example, on the protection-of-civilians mandate. We also need to establish a better common understanding of the political, strategic and operational aspects of robust peacekeeping, building on discussions currently under way with Member States.

As mandates grow more demanding, robust and dangerous, it is essential that there be a strong sense of common purpose and close linkage between the Council's intent and what TCCs and PCCs are ready to deliver. As the number of mandated tasks grows, we also need greater clarity on the extent of peacebuilding that peacekeeping missions should carry out and on the resources required for this. Security sector reform and strengthened rule of law are essential to help develop national capacity in the host country. That is extremely important both as part of the exit strategy of the mission that we all wish to achieve and in order to allow host countries to rebuild the institutions that allow them to effectively exercise their own sovereignty.

Broader peacebuilding also entails beginning early recovery, infrastructure and employment creation, and peacekeeping operations must rely on other peacebuilding partners to help deliver these. Kick-starting that sort of sustainable development is essential in Liberia, in Timor-Leste and in Haiti. The forthcoming report of the Secretary-General on peacebuilding will highlight the key areas of peacebuilding in which United Nations capability needs to be strengthened.

With regard to the second key area — the design, resourcing and deployment of missions — I would highlight the following as priority issues. First, there is a need to ensure sustained political support for the missions. We underscore the critical importance of an active, functional political process to address the conflict. Where our peacekeeping operations are struggling, it is usually the case that there is a lack of an inclusive peace process. Darfur clearly illustrates that point.

No matter how well trained and specialized our peacekeepers are, they cannot be successful without a viable peace process. Achievable mandates with clear political goals accompanied by continued political support from troop- and police-contributing countries and the Security Council is key. One way of contributing to that sustained political support is through informal coalitions of Member States focused on individual missions to assist in providing political and materiel support throughout the life of a mission.

The non-paper also argues that the Security Council should play a role to help ensure that critical capabilities are found. As one option, it recalls the Brahimi recommendation for a two-stage mandating process to help generate the necessary resources to ensure that a mandate is achievable before it is finalized.

There is a need to improve Secretariat planning processes and enhance dialogue with the Security Council and troop- and police-contributors on planning. We will look for ways to enhance dialogue on the Secretariat's planning process with the Council and TCCs, in particular those countries contributing significant capabilities and volunteering for complex tasks. We will also make proposals for faster, more focused mission start-ups and a better sequencing of deployment, to prioritize earlier deployment of critical capabilities that will advance mandate implementation and credibility. It is also important that we resolve the issue of rapidly deployable contingency reserves for missions that face significant risk of security crises.

Too many of our missions are lacking in critical capabilities. Troops in dangerous environments lack the information and mobility critical for force protection and mandate implementation. I believe a priority will be to agree on the nature of the capabilities required for modern peacekeeping. There must also be sufficient incentives to allow United Nations peacekeeping to obtain them. We operate simultaneously in the jungles of the Democratic Republic of the Congo, in the desert of Chad and Darfur and in urban centres such as Port-au-Prince. It is clear that different capabilities are needed in each setting. We believe there is a need to review the procedure for reimbursement of contingent-owned equipment to make sure they reflect today's reality. High-tech equipment cannot be reimbursed at the level of an armoured personnel carrier.

Out of necessity, we have focused our force generation on numbers rather than on what capabilities have been needed to fulfil the mandate of a given mission. Darfur is, again, a vivid example of this. We must together shift our focus to operational requirements and on how to better generate capabilities not just numbers. We need to jointly identify the type of capacity required, including agreed minimum standards for troops and police carrying out United Nations peacekeeping while also delivering essential improvements to the United Nations training system. And we must facilitate linkage of bilateral training capacities with potential new or existing troop- and police-contributing countries in need of specialized training to fulfil the requirements of United Nations peacekeeping.

I believe one critical goal of our overall strategy to ensure that peacekeeping has the capacities it needs must be to expand the base of troop- and police-contributors. There must be more equal burden-sharing in the United Nations system.

The Secretariat must also ensure that it addresses any outstanding questions regarding command and control that potential TCCs or PCCs may have. We also need to increase our interoperability with regional organizations, including, of course, the African Union, the European Union and subregional organizations. It is clear that supporting the African Union in building its capacity remains a very high priority.

Finally, I hold as a priority the articulation of the new field support strategy that the DFS is leading. Under-Secretary-General Malcorra will comment further on that, but I would just say that it is clear to me that United Nations peacekeeping today is the instrument of a hyperoperational United Nations. Yet, our support systems have not caught up with that new reality. We have to make adjustments in how we support our missions to increase flexibility and efficiency, but I will leave it to Ms. Malcorra to elaborate on that issue.

To conclude my remarks, I would like to say that the new partnership agenda that we have put forward is one that we will need to work on together. Together, we must set the agenda for the peacekeeping of tomorrow. We are looking forward to an intense dialogue with the Council on the way forward. I look forward to hearing more from the members of the Security Council, troop-contributing countries and financial contributors, and I

will endeavour to take account of their perspectives and concerns in the process of finalizing the DPKO/DFS non-paper.

We hope to continue this dialogue with the Council in the weeks and months to come. As we approach 10 years since the seminal reforms of the Brahimi report (S/2009/809), I believe that is the best way in which we can honour and protect the achievements of that report and build on it for the future.

I would also like to close by taking this opportunity to thank the Council for its critical role in guiding United Nations peacekeeping, and, of course, the TCCs and PCCs gathered here for their contributions to our current and past missions.

The President: I thank Mr. Le Roy for his briefing.

I now give the floor to Ms. Susana Malcorra, Under-Secretary-General for Field Support.

Ms. Malcorra (*spoke in Spanish*): I would like to echo Alain Le Roy's expression of appreciation for the time that the Security Council has given us for topics that are of great importance to us all.

(*spoke in English*)

This is a joint exercise of the Department of Peacekeeping Operations and the Department of Field Support. The two Departments are fully synchronized in that regard. The broad strategic outlines of this initiative have major implications for the support side of the house for the next five years.

Mr. Le Roy has outlined what we need in a new partnership agenda to address the problems that we are encountering in delivering increasingly complex and varied mandates in difficult, often isolated and inhospitable locations. I can only echo those needs on the support side. We cannot move ahead with innovations to the support model without the full engagement and buy-in of Member States.

Let me further elaborate on some of the broad support indications for the New Horizon initiative. First, I must stress that we are not starting from scratch here. The past decade has several useful innovations in the tools and systems developed for peacekeeping operations approved by Member States. The creation of the strategic deployment stocks in 2002 have allowed us to equip and supply missions more quickly than before. The establishment of a Peacekeeping Reserve Fund to allow for commitment authority of up to $50 million in advance of a Security Council mandate has also been an important capability.

However, neither of those innovations is calibrated to current demand. Their ceilings remain static, while the overall peacekeeping budget has more than tripled, and their procedures have become more convoluted than originally envisioned.

Secondly, I am convinced that more of the same will simply not do. We envisaged a more nuanced, targeted approach with elements of mission support provided globally, others regionally and the rest at the level of individual missions. The current model of having a full support component for each and every mission needs to be revisited. We need to explore options that will lead to a lighter mission footprint; faster turnaround without compromising accountability and oversight; smarter deployment with new security ceilings in a way that will bring about a better relationship between substantive and support staff in mission; greater use of local staff and local and regional suppliers; development and continuity of staff in safer and more stable locations; the creation of centres of excellence that would allow us to better support the missions; decision-making and supply closer to the point of delivery; and a revisit of the current contingent-owned equipment model, including the rates of reimbursement, as mentioned by Mr. Le Roy.

Thirdly, it is becoming increasingly important to calibrate support to the different stages of the mission life cycle — startup, stabilization, maturity, surge, drawdown and liquidation — with different priorities in terms of deployment in each of those stages. Staffing and equipment needs and financing are different in each of them.

In particular, we have identified specific support challenges in the startup phase. Clearly, one of the biggest issues that we face in relationships with Member States is the unspent balances, and that issue is related particularly to delays in the initial phase of deployment. Even if we introduce some of the improvements I have mentioned, we are still up against a system of financial approvals and procurement timelines that puts limits on rapid deployment.

Possible ways to address those issues include pre-positioned stocks and turnkey service contracts, more modular approaches, fast-track standardized

resourcing approaches for the first year of mission operation, some additional financial flexibility, and more asset-sharing between missions. That is particularly important in the case of aviation assets.

Fourthly, one way to build capability and performance without increasing initial headcount is to invest more in technology-driven solutions, including some greening elements that could be very important to our footprint in the countries where we deploy. Better information analysis, better communications and higher-performing equipment should be at the heart of those aspects.

Fifthly, again, building on reforms that the Member States have approved develops a truly global and mobile workforce with faster, more targeted recruitment, better skills and career development, and greater agility across functions and locations.

We will be developing all those five lines in the DFS support strategy that is now being worked on. I have already had informal exchanges of views with representatives during the month of May and have received some initial feedback. We will provide a more detailed non-paper in July, in conjunction with the New Horizon paper. My team is now drilling down into the detailed building of business cases and examining cost benefits, which we will be sharing and presenting as part of a comprehensive set of proposals at the next session of the General Assembly, seeking Member States' approval.

That is going to be a major paper and it will be presented together with the budgets of the peacekeeping operations for approval, hoping that, with Member States' approval, we will also seek initial opportunities in the next cycle of peacekeeping budgets.

I thank all present. We will provide further information for further discussion in the near future.

The President: I thank Ms. Malcorra for her briefing.

In accordance with the understanding reached among Council members, I wish to remind all speakers to limit their statements to no more than five minutes in order to enable the Council to carry out its work expeditiously. Delegations with lengthy statements are kindly requested to circulate their texts in writing and to deliver a condensed version when speaking in the Chamber.

I shall now give the floor to members of the Security Council.

Mr. Ripert (France) (*spoke in French*): I should first like to thank the Turkish presidency of the Council for organizing this debate. France is very committed to improving the functioning of United Nations peacekeeping. We welcome the current heightened activity on this issue, which seems to us to reflect, first of all, a convergence of concerns emanating from various quarters and the growing desire that this question has aroused to ensure the effectiveness of our efforts among the Security Council, Member States as a whole and the Secretariat.

With regard to the initiative that we and the United Nations have launched in connection with this issue, France has repeatedly asked that the Department of Peacekeeping Operations and the Department of Field Support make quarterly presentations on the state of United Nations peacekeeping in connection with operational, administrative, budgetary and financial aspects. It is therefore with pleasure that we welcome today's debate, which we hope will be followed by other similar meetings. I should like in particular to thank Mr. Alain Le Roy and Ms. Susana Malcorra for their presentation of the upcoming New Horizon study. We await the presentation of the final report later this year with great interest and anticipation.

Of course, I should also like to associate myself with the statement that will be made shortly by my Czech colleague on behalf of the European Union.

The elements set out by the Secretariat are especially encouraging to us. I would briefly first like to recall the three-pillar initiative that we launched with the United Kingdom as a way of underscoring the unity of perspective between the two approaches. The first part of our initiative pertains to the strategic conduct of operations. As the Secretariat has also done today, we have called for improvements in how mandates are drafted, how they are coordinated with planning, how goals are set and how benchmarks for success are established.

We fully support the idea of strengthening command and control mechanisms, in particular at the level of the Secretariat in New York. We also support the idea of improved dialogue among the main partners during the planning and implementation of operations. Meetings of political and military experts have proven

to be very useful in that regard. We believe they should be expanded to most operations.

It is also desirable to provide the Security Council with genuine military expertise by organizing, under a format yet to be determined, regular meetings of military advisers, including with the possible participation of troop-contributing countries.

The second pillar of our initiative pertains to the implementation of complex mandates. In that regard, we fully support the idea that the United Nations should be in a position to undertake more robust efforts. I should also like to underscore that it would be a mistake to prevent the United Nations from carrying out robust peacekeeping and to ignore the importance of the contributions of countries deeply involved in robust operations — not necessarily using Blue Helmets but nevertheless mandated by the Organization — such as, for example, in Afghanistan.

In that regard, I should like to point out that France is one of the main contributors to United Nations peacekeeping operations, to which it is the fifth-largest financial contributor. France provides almost 2,250 Blue Helmets and Berets. We also contribute some 1,300 men to peacekeeping operations under United Nations mandates in the framework of the European Union, NATO or at the national level — operations quite often in especially dangerous areas.

In our joint initiative, we of course fully support the implementation by peacekeeping operations of civilian protection mandates. In public opinion in the countries where the United Nations operates, the ability of the Organization to protect civilians is the standard by which we will be judged. In doing so, we acknowledge that we must be aware of the contradiction that sometimes exists — as we heard during the Security Council's recent visit to the Democratic Republic of the Congo — between simultaneously asking peacekeeping operations to take on a more robust posture and protect civilians more effectively. The contradiction clearly illustrates the need to adapt a mission's internal structure to the complexity of its mandate.

The third important point relates to the premature integration of post-conflict reconstruction into our strategies, as noted by the Under-Secretary-General. With respect to mandate priorities, as the Council is aware a significant effort has been made, reflected in particular in resolution 1856 (2008), on the Democratic Republic of the Congo. That effort should be pursued. However, resolutions are documents negotiated by sovereign States in the Security Council, including with non-member States. Given the respective political goals of participants, it is not always possible to establish a full or satisfactory hierarchy of objectives.

The issue of sequential implementation deserves further consideration. It is difficult to give a new mission too many tasks. We must therefore avoid that contradiction, as Alain Le Roy has also mentioned; in prioritizing urgent tasks, we neglect structural elements necessary both for an exit strategy and to ensure that conflicts do not recur or become prolonged. The establishment of the rule of law and the setting up of security forces fall under that category.

The same point could be made about the problem of better integrating United Nations military operations into the efforts of the rest of the system. The identification of an integrated approach — as was done in Timor-Leste, Liberia and the Congo — is clearly needed today. We must make it a reality. In that regard, defining concrete guidelines aimed at system-wide coherence is both crucial and urgent, and must be part of our discussion of peacekeeping.

In that regard, I should like to conclude by expressing our hope that the Working Group chaired by our colleague Ambassador Takasu will now turn its attention to a detailed consideration of the provisions of the mandates for peacekeeping operations. That would make a valuable contribution to the Council's future work.

Lastly, the third part of our initiative pertains to resources. We call for efforts to be made in the areas of effectiveness and cost. In that regard, we very much welcome the preliminary ideas set out today by Ms. Malcorra, including the crucial aspect of financial flexibility and responsibility and the adoption of new strategies for rapid deployment through a series of initiatives that the Secretariat could itself undertake. Those proposals will be fleshed out later. Ms. Malcorra can count on us to do everything possible to enable her to implement as soon as possible in the United Nations system ideas that are so simple and obvious that we could rightly wonder why they have not yet been implemented already. We shall help her do that as soon as possible.

Moreover, the future New Horizon study will rightly focus on the issue of force generation. That is a

key challenge in an overall climate of tensions ever the poor equipping and funding of troops. We are of course in favour of expanding the pool of troop and police contributors. In that regard, I recall the very significant efforts made by France and the European Union, in particular with regard to training African forces through the European Reinforcement of African Peacekeeping Capacities programme and the establishment of a network of military schools on the continent.

In that connection, I should like to mention the important issue of language training and promoting participation in peacekeeping operations by staff speaking local languages. In that connection, I am of course calling for francophone military, police and civilian personnel. Many operations are today deployed to francophone areas. The lack of French-speaking staff and the insufficient mastery of it by a significant number of peacekeeping staff both hinders the proper execution of operations and can even pose a risk to staff security. At any rate, that situation does not contribute to engendering good relations and trust among local populations. The issue of language must not be taboo when it comes to respecting Charter provisions and rules pertaining to the use of official languages at the Secretariat and in peacekeeping operations. We hope that an effort will be made in that regard.

The group of francophone countries over which I have the honour to preside has conferred with other language groups to clearly illustrate that this is a generalized problem of adapting to the situation on the ground. In that connection, I would just like to mention that we welcome the participation of the Under-Secretary-General at the seminars on peacekeeping operations organized recently at Bamako by the International Organization of la Francophonie. We also support a discussion on the mobility of reserves and the calls for sustainable resources.

My delegation welcomes the emphasis in the document — and the assumption underlying today's debate — on the need for consultations with the main contributors. Such consultations are of basic importance for the United Nations system of shared responsibility.

To conclude, I would like to reiterate our support for the Secretariat. The various aspects of the consideration of this issue must, of course, be taken up within in the competent entities: the Committee of Thirty-Four, the Fifth Committee and, of course, in the Security Council. In the framework of the Council, we are determined to promote the various proposals of our initiative, which will reach a new stage in August under the British presidency of the Council. We hope that we will be able to adopt an organizing framework at that point.

Mr. Mayr-Harting (Austria): At the outset, allow me to thank you, Mr. President, for organizing this debate, which gives us a timely opportunity to continue our discussions on this important matter. We particularly welcome the participation of major troop and financial contributors. Allow me to also thank Under-Secretary-General Alain Le Roy and Under-Secretary-General Susanna Malcorra for presenting us with a first executive summary of the New Horizon non-paper.

Austria also associates itself with the statement to be delivered by the Czech Republic on behalf of the European ' nion later in this meeting.

We support the ongoing processes focusing on the reform of United Nations peacekeeping. Austria would like to thank France, the United Kingdom, Japan as Chair of the Working Group of the Whole on United Nations Peacekeeping Operations, and Canada for their efforts. We have already witnessed some first changes in the Council's approach to mandate extensions, including the more systematic use of benchmarks and progress monitoring.

We have studied the executive summary of the New Horizon non-paper, which identifies the key challenges of United Nations peacekeeping, and we are looking forward to more detailed proposals in the non-paper.

This Department of Peacekeeping Operations initiative is most timely. We also believe that the Brahimi report, though written at a time when only 20,000 peacekeepers were deployed, has not lost its validity. Some of its core issues need to be revisited, but it can still provide useful guidance to our efforts.

Austria, as a longstanding troop and police contributor to United Nations peacekeeping operations and to other United Nations mandated peace missions, supports initiatives for improved cooperation and coordination between troop-contributing countries, police-contributing countries and the Council. We need a better inclusion of troop- and police-contributing

countries and financial contributors when planning and reviewing peacekeeping mandates.

Clear and achievable mandates are key to the success of United Nations peace operations. The formulation of mandates ought to take into account all the tools in question, on the basis of a needs assessment. The tools we choose must be part of an overall political strategy and serve clear goals. In many cases, the resulting mandate will therefore need to follow a phased approach. Given the unprecedented expansion of United Nations peacekeeping and the limits to human and financial resources, other available options for responding to conflicts, in particular preventive action, must be considered very seriously.

Shaping an integrated and coherent strategy in close cooperation with other international, regional, subregional, local and possibly non-governmental actors will be crucial for the success of our future approach. In this regard, we strongly support an enhanced cooperation with interested regional organizations. As far as peacekeeping on the African continent is concerned, close cooperation with the African Union (AU) must remain a particular priority. Strengthening the capacities of the AU is an essential prerequisite for fair and equitable burden-sharing in contributing to peace and security and for stronger regional and national ownership. For this very reason, we are in favour of a substantial and open-minded debate of the proposals contained in the Prodi report.

The lessons learned and the experiences gained by the various missions on the ground, and in particular by national contingents, can provide the Council with comprehensive information for its deliberations on the review and extension of mandates. Early and consistent involvement of Force Commanders as well as troop- and police-contributing countries will help to create common understanding and trust, as well as an increased willingness to effectively implement the mandates adopted by the Council. While the Council bears the main responsibility for establishing achievable mandates, troop- and police-contributing countries and other actors have the responsibility to deliver on the ground and must therefore be given an adequate hearing.

In the Council's debate on the protection of civilians this past Friday, we reiterated our support for the strengthening of protection mandates in peacekeeping operations. Their role in ensuring the physical protection of the civilian population affected by armed conflict, and in particular of women and children, is of utmost importance. Their contribution to the promotion of human rights, the strengthening of the rule of law and an increased role for women in peace processes and peacebuilding, as well as in the fight against impunity, is invaluable. It is clear that, in order to implement protection mandates, peacekeeping missions must be more effective and better resourced.

We are convinced that the independent study commissioned by the Department of Peacekeeping Operations (DPKO) and the Office for the Coordination of Humanitarian Affairs on protection mandates in peace operations will make important recommendations and will thus add to the overall reform efforts of United Nations peacekeeping. As I already mentioned this past Friday, Austria hopes that the Council will be in a position to make progress in this matter in the framework of the debate on the protection of civilians scheduled for the month of November.

We also believe that the international community needs to pay increased attention to the interface between security and development — particularly in post-conflict and other fragile situations.

Peace operations can make important contributions to a sustainable socio-economic development of the region in which they are deployed. An increased emphasis on local and regional procurement is just one of the options that come to mind. Building on some of the positions put forward during the Council's January debate on peacekeeping, Austria has begun a dialogue with DPKO, the Department of Field Support and the Peacebuilding Support Office on how to optimize the socio-economic impact of peace missions. We look forward to working with other interested delegations on this important issue.

Allow me to conclude by reiterating Austria's dedication to the reform of United Nations peacekeeping, a process that needs our urgent and continued commitment if we wish to achieve noteworthy results in the foreseeable future.

Mr. Okuda (Japan): First of all, my Mission would like to express to the President of the Security Council, Ambassador İlkin, and his Mission, its appreciation for their decision to convene this meeting on peacekeeping operations. Our appreciation also goes to the United Kingdom and France for their initiative on peacekeeping operations.

United Nations peacekeeping operations have been one of the most important tools available to the Security Council to address situations in countries emerging from conflict. As conflict situations have become more diverse, United Nations peacekeeping has been faced with greater challenges.

Currently, United Nations peacekeeping operations are tasked with a broad range of mandates. Overstretched operations are faced with challenges in logistics, finance and force generation, which give rise to significant gaps between mandates and their implementation. We welcome the New Horizon initiative presented to the Council today by Under-Secretaries-General Le Roy and Malcorra to address these challenges. We look forward to a constructive and useful dialogue on this initiative between Member States and the Secretariat.

Allow me to contribute the following three observations to address the issue of mandate implementation.

First, while the mandates are given by the Council, there should also be a common and clear understanding among all stakeholders, including major troop- and police-contributing countries, countries in the region and host nations, as to which tasks are to be given to the mission and to what extent they are expected to be accomplished.

Allow me to offer a useful example. Since the Council established the United Nations mission in Timor-Leste, the Timor-Leste core group, comprised of countries having strong relationships with the country, has been facilitating consideration of the issue by the Council. The views of the countries that have direct and broad contact with the respective host nations are extremely valuable in enabling the Council to formulate clear, achievable and effective mandates. Taking them into account lends the Council's work greater legitimacy and authority. It is also indispensable to hear the views of the major troop- and police-contributing countries, whose personnel can provide direct information on conditions in the field. Realistic evaluation of the situation in the field is key to the formulation of a realistic mandate. In this regard, tripartite cooperation among the Council, troop-contributing countries and the Secretariat, through more intensive information sharing and efforts to reach common understanding on the nature of operations, should be enhanced.

Secondly, complex and robust peacekeeping mandates require troops that are more capable and well trained. The quality of the personnel is more important than the numbers. For this reason, we concur with the Secretariat on the necessity of broadening the contributor base. To the same end, it is necessary that the international community further develop training programmes for the troops in a coordinated manner.

Japan is working with peacekeeping operation training centres in Africa to build the capacity of African troops. Japan is also working with countries of the Association of Southeast Asian Nations (ASEAN), as shown in the third meeting of the ASEAN Regional Forum's peacekeeping experts in Cambodia. That meeting was held from 24 to 26 June under the co-chairmanship of Cambodia and Japan, and the participants had a very fruitful discussion on ways and means for enhancing the regional capacity to participate in United Nations peacekeeping operations.

Lastly, it is quite understandable that people in distress expect much from a United Nations mission tasked with mandates such as protection of civilians. However, gaps between expectations and implementation can quickly lead to disappointment and undermine the credibility of the United Nations. That in turn makes it more difficult to implement the assigned mandates.

To avoid this spiral, it would be useful to establish a common understanding among relevant partners, including the local population, about the role of the peacekeepers on the ground through proactive communication and by establishing standard operating procedures governing the protection of civilians and how the United Nations mission coordinates with other humanitarian agencies and non-governmental organizations. We should also pay sufficient attention to achieving a return to normal life for the local populace through the early recovery of socio-economic stability and thus alleviate any frustration that may be building among them. At the same time, the international community should strive to make accurate assessments of the developments on the ground and the work of the mission without exerting any pressure, in order to avoid arriving at premature decisions regarding the mandate and work of the mission. We should try to find realistic and practical ways to operate missions in spite of the complicated situation surrounding them.

Today's timely debate contributes to our understanding of the challenges confronting peacekeeping activities. Japan, in its capacity as Chair of the Security Council's Working Group on Peacekeeping Operations, will spare no effort to facilitate exchanges of views among all stakeholders in order to find workable solutions for current challenges. The Working Group has had four fruitful meetings so far this year, with the participation of troop- and police-contributing countries, countries contributing financially and other stakeholders, to discuss how to address gaps between the mandate and its implementation. In that connection, we sought firsthand feedback on conditions on the ground from the troop-contributing countries and the Secretariat. Based on that fruitful discussion, we plan to prepare an interim report on the work of the Working Group for submission to the Council next month with the aim of contributing to improvements in operational aspects. I ask for the constructive engagement of the members of the Working Group in this regard.

The various ongoing initiatives, including the Working Group, should be mutually reinforcing and should contribute to setting a new direction for improved United Nations peacekeeping and the accumulation of practical and realistic solutions. Japan will continue to be actively engaged in this endeavour as Chair of the Working Group on Peacekeeping Operations as well as in its activities as a Member State.

Mr. Rugunda (Uganda): We wish to thank you, Mr. President, for organizing this important debate on United Nations peacekeeping operations, bringing together troop- and police-contributing countries. Interactions such as this between troop- and police-contributing countries will further enhance our understanding of the dynamics of peacekeeping and the planning, coordination and implementation of United Nations peacekeeping operations.

We thank Mr. Alain Le Roy, Under-Secretary-General for Peacekeeping Operations, and Susana Malcorra, Under-Secretary-General for Field Support, for their presentations. In this regard, we wish to commend the initiatives of the Secretariat in preparing the New Horizon command paper. We also commend the efforts of the Special Committee on Peacekeeping Operations, the initiative of Canada and the Center on International Cooperation, the review process launched by the United Kingdom and France within the Security Council, and the work of the Security Council's Working Group on Peacekeeping Operations in the ongoing debate on peacekeeping.

The number and scope of the United Nations peacekeeping operations are at the highest level ever, stretching the system's capacity. The reality is that for many people out there where the United Nations has a peacekeeping operation, the arrival of United Nations peacekeepers brings the hope that the horrors and insecurity they had to endure would be no more. We know that while in some parts of the world the United Nations has been successful in meeting the hopes and dreams of the affected populations, in others it has not been as successful.

Where peacekeeping has not been successful, part of the reason is that it has been overwhelmed by the task, or has lacked the appropriate mandate or adequate troops, or has even lacked assets and, sometimes, resolve. Ultimately, where peacekeeping has not been successful, a holistic approach to handling the challenges at hand has been lacking.

It is a fact that recent operations have highlighted the gap between demand and supply in some of these areas. Where the United Nations has not met the expectations of the people, the result has been an affected population with mixed feelings of hope, frustration and even hostility to the United Nations presence. As we discuss peacekeeping operations, therefore, we must conduct a reality check so that together the entire international community learns some of the lessons from our successes and also from our failures.

That underscores the importance of the relationship between the Security Council and the countries that contribute the men and women who serve on United Nations missions, and the need to strengthen the existing mechanism for engagement. Although there are mechanisms for this interaction, there is a need to strengthen the existing arrangements to improve the dialogue between those who plan and mandate United Nations peacekeeping operations — that is, the Council — and those who implement the mandates on the ground, where they often face considerable risks. Thus we are convinced that this debate is timely and will further strengthen United Nations peacekeeping to meet the needs of contemporary challenges.

A common understanding is needed about what United Nations peacekeeping should be mandated to do and what it can do. In recent years there has been a

shift towards more robust and comprehensive United Nations peacekeeping, such as in the Democratic Republic of the Congo. In addition to maintaining peace and security, peacekeepers are increasingly charged with assisting in political processes, supporting humanitarian efforts, reforming justice systems, training law enforcement and security forces, and disarming former combatants and foreign armed groups.

Given these challenges, it is indeed imperative to address such issues as the degree of robustness of modern United Nations peacekeeping, how protection of civilians mandates can be best implemented, and what peacekeeping tasks should be undertaken by United Nations peacekeepers and for how long. This requires a clear understanding of the situation on the ground before mandates are designed.

Clear entrance and exit strategies should also be elaborated with the principal actors concerned. To that end, we support the revitalization of the Military Staff Committee, with the participation of all members of the Council, so that it can play a more active role in providing the relevant technical input. All these issues require a strong understanding between contributor countries and the Council as to what is expected of peacekeepers and what they require to fulfil these objectives.

Developing peacekeeping capability depends on a combination of political will and the availability of resources on the part of Member States. The lack of political will undermines the credibility of the United Nations; lack of resources compounds the problem by limiting the ability of any peacekeeping mission to implement its mandate. The United Nations should therefore endeavour to broaden the contributor base by working with partners at the regional and subregional levels and by taking advantage of their capacities.

The complexity of modern peacekeeping clearly indicates that no single organization, not even the United Nations, is capable of tackling challenges of such magnitude alone. Security challenges require a collective approach, which should seek to establish coordination at both the strategic and the programmatic levels. The United Nations should therefore take maximum advantage of the strengths that respective organizations, especially regional organizations such as the African Union, can contribute. However, that will require the establishment or strengthening of strategic relationships that may exist with regional organizations.

Effective peacekeeping is an objective that we share. To that end, the Council and the troop- and police-contributing countries have an important role to play. We need to focus on strengthening their relationship and interaction during the different stages of a peacekeeping mission, especially early in the planning stages of a new mission or whenever there is a change in the mandate. We also need to give attention to the coordination of the various initiatives of United Nations peacekeeping in order to reinforce complementarities and avoid the duplication of efforts.

Uganda therefore supports a stronger convergence in United Nations peacekeeping, with a clear set of achievable goals in the immediate, medium and long terms so as to meet the challenges of today and tomorrow. We also support the aim of strengthening the unity and cohesion of all stakeholders, enhancing the credibility of United Nations peacekeeping, and building its capacity with a view to making it more predictable and adaptable to emerging challenges, such as that in Somalia. We recommend that the Working Group of the Whole on United Nations Peacekeeping Operations undertake an in-depth consideration of the proposals made during our debates, and report to the Council before the end of the year.

Finally, Uganda pays tribute to the men and women of the United Nations for their tireless sacrifices in helping to make our world a safer place in which to live. We especially remember and honour those who have made the ultimate sacrifice in the service of peace.

Mr. Kafando (Burkina Faso) (*spoke in French*): At the outset, I thank you, Sir, for choosing the topic of United Nations peacekeeping operations as the subject of our discussion today. I should also like to thank Mr. Le Roy and Ms. Malcorra for their briefings.

The maintenance of peace is one of the principal responsibilities of the United Nations. If it is to accomplish that important mission, it is natural that the Organization should have a strategy for making its peacekeeping operations as effective as possible. In that regard and as many have pointed out, the Brahimi report (S/2000/809) is a fundamental reference document that has enabled us to undertake useful reforms in the United Nations in order to adapt our action to increasingly complex new situations.

As time passes, however, we must give new consideration to how to meet the many challenges facing peacekeeping operations in terms of the political commitment of the actors, the participation of States, the financing and conception of missions, the equipping of troops and organization. We therefore encourage the involvement of the greatest possible number of Member States, particularly troop-contributing countries, in the current thinking on this issue. We pay tribute to the Japanese delegation for engaging an ever-growing number of Member States in the Working Group of the Whole on United Nations Peacekeeping Operations, which it chairs. We hope that, following an intergovernmental process, the Organization will be able to make us of the innovative ideas that will emerge from the process as a whole, with the principal objective of improving the conduct of peacekeeping operations.

It is of paramount importance that the United Nations be able to mobilize as many troops as are needed to address crisis situations in a timely manner. To that end, all Member States should be able to contribute to peace missions because, after all, peacekeeping is a collective responsibility. It is essential in particular to broaden the involvement of troop-contributing countries, which should not be confined to just a few individual countries, but should encompass all States. Moreover, efforts must be made to support those States that genuinely wish to contribute troops but do not have the resources to do so.

The quest for effectiveness also requires us to give sustained focus to the mandates of peacekeeping operations. Indeed, as many have stressed, the drafting of mandates remains the subject of debate that is justified in part by the gap between realities on the ground and the missions assigned to troops. We must continue to seek to endow United Nations forces with realistic mandates and clear rules of engagement that guarantee protection for innocent civilians, especially women and children. However, they must also be endowed with sufficient deterrent capacity in order to ensure an operation's success.

None of this can be accomplished without the support of Member States, the Secretariat, troop-contributing countries and host countries, which must all offer sustained political support and open cooperation to peacekeeping missions. The provisions of resolution 1353 (2001) remain relevant and should be exploited in order to strengthen such cooperation.

With better-equipped and better-trained troops and adequate mandates, the United Nations can attain short-term goals. But sometimes that can be in vain over the long term if the United Nations confines itself to addressing physical security. It should support political processes and help implement peace agreements. It should also work with the country concerned in the development sphere, because a lasting peace process cannot be guaranteed unless the underlying causes of the crisis are resolved; these include poverty, exclusion and poor governance.

We cannot ignore the substantial peacekeeping experience of the United Nations. While there have been tragic examples in the course of the Organization's history, it is important also to highlight the successes, which are far more numerous.

In recent years, regional organizations too have demonstrated their commitment and their capacity to manage major crises. It would be desirable to further strengthen their central role in peacekeeping. The United Nations should be able to support them in that respect. We encourage in particular the strengthening of the partnership between the United Nations and the African Union in the peacekeeping sphere, as called for by all delegations that participated in the Council's open debate on 18 March (see S/PV.6092). We are certain that efforts will be made to strengthen the peacekeeping capacity of the African Union, as recommended by the African Union-United Nations panel to consider the modalities of how to support African Union peacekeeping operations established under a United Nations mandate.

The available resources are limited, so we believe that we must further rationalize United Nations action. At the same time, we are concerned about options that would impose sometimes subjective deadlines and criteria regarding the termination of operations. We remain convinced that early withdrawal can be tragic, and more costly for the Organization. Hence, we must better assess the threat of instability and the re-eruption of crisis before terminating an operation or moving to the peacebuilding stage. Specifically, during the special phase of disarmament, demobilization and reintegration (DDR), the United Nations — while ensuring the availability of funding for DDR programmes — should ensure that the operation is successfully carried out.

We pay tribute to the men and women who, through peacekeeping operations, provide security and

stability in conflict zones, many of whom have lost their lives. War is a tragedy, and in our view more must be done to prevent the outbreak of conflict. We must also place a sharper focus on prevention, including by promoting mediation and creating early warning mechanisms to prevent latent crises from erupting into open conflict. Such approaches are more desirable and far less costly than peacekeeping, peace-restoration or peacebuilding operations.

Troop-contributing countries, the Secretariat, financial partners and regional organizations all have their respective shares of responsibility in carrying out peacekeeping operations. We must try to reduce the communication gap among those players; we must involve them in the various stages of the establishment of peacekeeping operations. We believe that, if we all work together, our current deliberations will help build trust among all the key players and will enhance the effectiveness of action by the United Nations.

Let me say in conclusion that we support the recommendation offered by the Permanent Representative of France regarding greater attention to the question of languages in peacekeeping operations.

Mr. Liu Zhenmin (China) (*spoke in Chinese*): The Chinese delegation thanks you, Mr. President, for convening today's open debate, which provides a useful forum for the parties concerned to engage in an in-depth discussion of the situation regarding United Nations peacekeeping and many challenges faced by United Nations peacekeeping operations. I thank Under-Secretaries-General Le Roy and Malcorra for their briefings. We look forward to the New Horizon report, to be submitted soon by the Secretary-General.

United Nations peacekeeping operations have been developing for more than six decades; they have become an important tool for the maintenance of international peace and building collective security. United Nations peacekeeping operations have evolved from their initial role of supervising ceasefires into integrated, multisectoral, multifaceted operations that cover the political, human rights and security areas. United Nations peacekeeping operations are facing a situation of increasing demand, expanding scale, increasingly diverse mandates and growing complexity. That situation has placed greater demands on these operations in terms of financing, personnel and management.

To enhance the effectiveness of United Nations peacekeeping operations, it is important that necessary reforms be undertaken.

First, we believe that, in order to increase the effectiveness of these operations, it is important to strengthen and enhance their strategic design and planning. The Security Council should devote attention to coordination between peacekeeping and peacebuilding. Equal attention should be devoted to the political settlement of armed conflicts on the one hand and to the dispatch of peacekeeping operations on the other. It is important to ensure that there is a peace to keep. At the same time, the Council should devote attention to other approaches that could result in the peaceful settlement of disputes, with a view to reducing peacekeeping costs.

Secondly, in order to increase the effectiveness of United Nations peacekeeping operations it is necessary to ensure that the operation is provided with the financial resources it needs. Against the backdrop of an expanding world financial crisis and the continued rise of peacekeeping costs, the resources available for peacekeeping have grown increasingly strained. We urge that United Nations Member States continue to pay their assessments in full and on time in order to ensure that peacekeeping operations can be carried out smoothly. On the other hand, in order to meet an increasing demand for peacekeeping operations, we would also welcome exploration of other channels for the financing of peacekeeping. We favour strengthened evaluation and monitoring of United Nations peacekeeping operations so as to effectively enhance the efficiency of the use of resources and to ensure that limited resources are allocated to critical areas.

Thirdly, in order to increase the effectiveness of United Nations peacekeeping operations it is necessary to enhance the capacity to raise personnel and equipment. The key to translating a commitment to peace into real results on the ground is the ability to raise adequate personnel and equipment in a timely manner. We encourage more Member States to participate in United Nations peacekeeping operations. At the same time, we believe that the Organization should assist relevant countries in training their peacekeeping personnel. We support continued efforts by the Secretariat to enhance its rapid deployment capacity and enhance its communication with troop-contributing countries.

Africa has special requirements with respect to United Nations peacekeeping operations. At present 75 per cent of peacekeepers are deployed in Africa. The Council should therefore encourage the African Union to play a more active role. It is also important to strengthen strategic cooperation between those two actors.

Fourthly, in order to increase the effectiveness of United Nations peacekeeping operations it is important to secure the full understanding and participation of the parties concerned. In recent years, some United Nations peacekeeping operations have been reproached as having been less than impartial and fair. Moreover, peacekeeping personnel are facing severe security challenges on the ground. There may be many causes behind that situation, but one of them is host countries' misunderstandings concerning peacekeeping operations. Thus, adherence to Dag Hammarskjöld's three principles of peacekeeping is an important basis for carrying out a successful United Nations peacekeeping operation.

The process of deciding upon and deploying a United Nations peacekeeping operations involves a number of actors, including the Security Council, the Special Committee on Peacekeeping Operations, the Secretariat and the troop-contributing countries. It is necessary that they be permitted to offer their comparative advantages and that cooperation and consultation among them be strengthened. It is very important to benefit from the wisdom and strength of all the parties concerned.

Fifthly, in order to strengthen the effectiveness of United Nations peacekeeping operations, it is important to improve their management. We support the Secretariat's continuing efforts to maintain close contact with the Council and to ensure that the mandate of the peacekeeping operations is more targeted and pragmatic. We support improving the management capacity of peacekeeping operations; at the same time, any measures taken in this area must be transparent. United Nations Headquarters must be given adequate and capable personnel, and it is important to provide each mission with a highly qualified special representative of the Secretary-General and troop commander. On top of that, it is necessary to further strengthen coordination between Headquarters and the ground. We support the Secretariat in its continued efforts to explore adequate means of logistics, and we also encourage Member States that are able to do so to give assistance in this area.

China has always actively participated in United Nations peacekeeping operations and has made its contribution to the United Nations peacekeeping cause. We support reasonable reforms to the peacekeeping operations and are ready to work with other parties to this end.

Mr. Heller (*spoke in Spanish*): We were extremely pleased by the initiative taken by the Turkish delegation to hold this debate, as well as to develop the concept paper on peacekeeping operations. This gives us an opportunity to continue collective discussion within our Organization in order to improve working relationships and communication between the Security Council and the financial and troop contributors to peacekeeping operations.

We are also grateful for the presentation made by Mr. Alain Le Roy, Under-Secretary-General for Peacekeeping Operations, as well as by Ms. Susana Malcorra, Under-Secretary-General for Field Support.

We are pleased to see the document that will serve as the basis for defining a New Horizon, based on a strengthened convergence of partnerships around the purpose, action and future of United Nations peacekeeping operations. Special attention should be given to the proposal to establish a new partnership agenda, which would incorporate three elements: first, improving the unity and cohesion of the actors involved in the management, planning and administration of peacekeeping operations; secondly, endowing the operations themselves with greater credibility; and, thirdly, strengthening this capacity so that they may continue to be an instrument for safeguarding world peace and security. We hope that the proposals generated by this meeting will make it possible to establish better mechanisms for dialogue between the Security Council and the contributing countries.

During the Security Council's last debate on this topic, in January, my delegation underscored the need to identify areas where we need more action, as well as good practices that may be applied in the future, given the growing complexity of the international scenarios that United Nations peace operations are facing. In this respect, there seen to us to be five key areas: First, centralization of the decision-making process for the establishment of a peacekeeping operation; the need for precise political leadership in order to help define the conditions that will determine the success of a mission; taking into account the multidimensional

character of operations, as well as the nature of conflicts, in order to arrive at collective approaches based on different types of cooperation, with greater coordination at the strategy and programme level; the importance of protecting the civilian population as an essential element in strengthening peace operations; and the need to establish an effective planning and coordination mechanism.

Mexico is interested in seeking joint proposals in order to improve the design, planning, preparation and administration of peacekeeping operations. In this respect, it is important to include the participation of contributing countries, as it would broaden and enrich our vision of operations and enhance their viability by incorporating those countries' knowledge, experience and practices. We should stress that we need to assess how to improve the protection of civilians, especially children, in armed conflicts, as well as the effectiveness of strategic partnerships between the Security Council and regional and other field organizations. As by far the largest financial contributor in Latin America to United Nations peacekeeping operations, Mexico is committed to these aims.

Though there have been numerous proposals over the years for improving communication between the Security Council and the financial- or troop-contributing countries, we have not managed to structure them in a formal way. Resolution 1327 (2000) recommended strengthening the system through private consultations, but we have not yet succeeded in institutionalizing this proposal. We have to decide whether the current structure and existing mechanisms for dialogue between the Council and the contributing countries are suitable, or if, on the contrary, we should establish new ways and methods of promoting fuller discussion. In this respect, we should see if it is preferable to have a structured dialogue or to establish interactive formats that could be even more effective.

One aspect that we could consider in order to formalize the abundant proposals stemming from this debate is to ask the Secretary-General to establish a mechanism with the contributing countries within the Department of Peacekeeping Operations that could provide timely support and advice to the Security Council before it establishes particular mandates. It would be a type of advisory council.

It would also be useful to increase the participation of the Department of Peacekeeping Operations, as well as the main countries contributing to each operation, in the analysis carried out by the Council of every mandate before the latter is renewed or changed. This would make it possible to have a specific and timely review of the achievements, challenges and opportunities that every mission faces, as well as the priorities and viability of the components of every mandate. It would also be desirable to update the request contained in resolution 1353 (2001) for the Secretary-General to always include in the reports on peacekeeping operations a section on his discussions with contributing countries.

The complexity of peacekeeping operations reflects the need to seek ever-larger and more flexible mechanisms for complementarity and coordination among its various bodies, as well as with other entities in the area of peacekeeping. Today we have helped to improve the dialogue with countries that contribute troops, police and resources to the peace missions. In the future, we believe that we will also have to include in this dialogue those who contribute through other activities, such as constructing hospitals, assisting refugees, supporting electoral processes, building institutions, as well as providing training for education, health and judicial system programmes, among others. It is important to take advantage of the experience that these countries provide by taking it into account when we design peacekeeping operations.

It is also crucial to promote an ongoing dialogue with the major financial contributors to peace operations. In this respect, we must reflect on the distribution of financial responsibilities between the Security Council and the General Assembly in the area of peacekeeping operations, especially given their proliferation.

Let us not forget that we find ourselves in an especially serious global financial crisis that makes the burden of financial commitments for the States and international organizations even greater. This is a valuable lesson for the future which we cannot overlook.

To conclude, Mexico believes that, in order to ensure the credibility and legitimacy of the United Nations, we have to establish peace operations that have the proper financial, political and military resources to fully comply with their mandates in the terms that we have described.

Sir John Sawers (United Kingdom): Mr. President, I join others in thanking you for scheduling today's

debate. We welcome the opportunity to hear later in the meeting the views of the Member States that play a leading role in making United Nations peacekeeping a reality. I would like to thank Under-Secretaries-General Le Roy and Malcorra for the important work under way in their Departments and for the executive summary of their Departments' recent work. Their briefings today cover some important plans for reform.

The United Kingdom fully supports a new effort to ensure a meaningful dialogue between the Secretariat, which plans and manages peacekeeping operations; the Security Council, which agrees to political objectives; and the troop- and police-contributors, which provide the personnel. The enhanced consultation will help ensure that, together, we have a shared understanding of the purpose of each mission; we set realistic, achievable and manageable mandates, we ensure more coherent and integrated mission planning; and we make best use of the resources available.

This year has seen a number of initiatives on United Nations peacekeeping launched across the United Nations community. I believe that the various initiatives reflect the concern we all share that peacekeeping in ever more complex environments demands greater efforts to ensure that we achieve the effect we want and that the current initiatives are complementary and mutually supportive.

Ambassador Ripert of France spoke of the United Kingdom/French initiative in the Security Council. Our objective is to improve the Council's own approach to the process of mandating and reviewing peacekeeping missions. We have made progress and we plan to reflect on that during the United Kingdom presidency of the Council in August. Our goal is to ensure that the Security Council plays its part in improving the strategic management of peacekeeping. We are not seeking to infringe upon those parts of the wider debate that remain the prerogative of the General Assembly. Peacekeeping is an important resource that belongs to all of us, and we have a shared responsibility to ensure that the huge resources and effort that go into peacekeeping produce the best possible results.

The Security Council has examined in the past how to strengthen consultations with countries outside its membership which contribute the personnel and resources to peacekeeping operations. The topic was a feature of the Brahimi report, and resolution 1327 (2001) established an improved system of consultations with the troop-contributing countries, with the goal of building a common understanding of a mission's mandate and its implementation.

The evolving nature of peacekeeping requires that we look again at the way we do this and, in particular, at the involvement of the troop-contributing countries. Member States reiterated this point in meetings of the Japan-chaired Security Council Working Group. The United Kingdom would like to see more profitable use made of the structures and meetings established by early resolutions.

Engagement between contributors, the Secretariat and members of the Council early on as to the challenges and opportunities a mission faces, well in advance of Council decisions, will mean that those decisions on the extension, adaptation or termination of a peacekeeping mandate will be better informed and more fully considered.

The consultation should also embrace the thematic challenges facing peacekeeping. For example, we need greater clarity and consensus on what can reasonably be expected of peacekeeping operations with respect to the protection of civilians. We had an opportunity to consider some of these issues in our debate last week and we will have further opportunities to address the issue during the Austrian presidency. We hope that this subject can also be an issue for discussion during next year's session of the Special Committee on Peacekeeping Operations.

The Council has seen first-hand the importance of building local capacity in countries with peacekeeping operations, particularly the local police and security services. It has become evident from the recent Council visits to Haiti, the Democratic Republic of the Congo and Liberia that too little emphasis is being placed on this issue, and that there remains a high dependence on United Nations peacekeepers to provide local security. If we are to achieve the national ownership we all strive for, we must concentrate on ensuring that peacebuilding objectives, particularly for local capacity in the security sector, can be established at the outset.

In the executive summary of the forthcoming New Horizon report, the Department of Peacekeeping Operations (DPKO) proposes that the Security Council consider ways to mobilize coalitions of States and other parties to ensure political and practical support to United Nations missions. We welcome this proposal. One possibility would be for a lead nation to be

identified within a core of contributors that could be involved in the planning and development of a specific mission from the outset.

The United Kingdom firmly supports the goals of the New Horizon project set forth by the DPKO and the Department of Field Support (DFS). We now need to agree on a new agenda for partnership across Member States to ensure efficient and, above all, successful peacekeeping operations. I was particularly struck by Ms. Malcorra's proposals to combine support packages for missions in the same region, to seek more local staff and local and regional suppliers, to tailor the United Nations approach to the different needs of the various stages of peacekeeping operations and to shorten the procurement timelines to allow for more rapid deployment. We look forward to working with both DFS and DPKO to assist in delivering on these demanding but important objectives as part of our wider goals on strengthening United Nations peacekeeping.

Mr. Guillermet (Costa Rica) (*spoke in Spanish*): Mr. President, I would like to begin by thanking you and your delegation for organizing this debate. We believe that this is an extremely valuable opportunity to exchange points of view on the current challenges to peacekeeping operations, especially at a time when several initiatives for discussion on this item are being developed within and without the Security Council. We are especially pleased to see the participation of several troop- and police-contributing countries and we hope that we can continue the practice of including these countries in the Council's discussion on this item.

The concept paper that has been circulated by the delegation of Turkey invites us to focus on the important topic of the relationship between the Security Council and troop- and police-contributing countries. This is a topic that the Council has been discussing for more than 15 years and that has been the subject of several presidential statements and resolutions over the years, which shows the importance of the topic.

However, we go on discussing this matter because, unfortunately, we acknowledge that the level of interaction between the main partners involved in peacekeeping operations is still very limited. We have all witnessed the wide gap that exists between the Council, the contributing countries, the Secretariat and even host countries. This situation is of enormous concern to us because it is clear to our country that communication and coordination among all of the actors involved in peacekeeping operations are a crucial factor for a mission's success, while the lack of both could have serious implications on the ground.

In order to improve and strengthen this partnership among the Council, the troop-contributing countries, the Secretariat and the host country, we need proactive and specific action on the part of all of actors. It is clear to us, following our experience as an elected member of the Security Council, that we have to change the exclusive institutional culture that prevails within the Council in order to make it more inclusive.

In this regard, over the next six months it will continue to be a priority for our country to work with other delegations in the Council to ensure full compliance with existing standards, in particular, the note by the President of the Security Council contained in document S/2006/507, resolutions 1327 (2000) and 1353 (2001), and Article 44 of the Charter of the United Nations, and to promote specific steps to increase the frequency and, above all, quality of the interaction between the Council and the troop-contributing countries, the Secretariat and host countries, especially at the expert level. Likewise, we hope that one of the results of the France/United Kingdom initiative to analyze the different aspects of peacekeeping operations will be a renewed commitment by the Council to deepen the interaction among those actors. We hope that will be the case.

We also view very positively the efforts of the delegation of Japan — whom we thank for their leadership — as Chair of the Working Group on Peacekeeping Operations and in organizing meetings of the Working Group with the TCCs and the Secretariat. We hope that practice will continue, and we believe that it would be valuable to consider holding similar meetings on individual missions before the next renewal of their mandates.

In the past, Costa Rica has also argued for closer involvement of the Secretariat during the Council's decision-making process on peacekeeping operations. When the Council's experts meet to negotiate a resolution, they should take the advice of the Secretariat into account, as we have seen in many negotiations in the General Assembly and as in fact we have heard that the Council has done in past years. In that manner it could inform the Council in a timely manner of the practical, operational and financial implications of the Council's proposals.

An important step was taken with the recent establishment of the group of experts on the protection of civilians, through which the members of the Council can interact with officials from the Office for the Coordination of Humanitarian Affairs prior to negotiating the mandate. However, similar interaction is lacking with other entities of the Secretariat, in particular with the Department of Peacekeeping Operations and the Department of Field Support.

As we said earlier, strengthening relations between the main players involved in peacekeeping is everyone's responsibility, not only that of the Council. The Secretariat must ensure provision of timely and detailed information to the Council and to the TCCs, especially in crisis situations. Furthermore, we believe that there could be a greater effort on the part of the Secretariat to share information with all Council members — not only, as we sometimes see, with some members, mainly the permanent members.

On the other hand, although it is true that we need greater opportunities for dialogue with the TCCs, we are concerned that the opportunities that already exist are underused, especially the private meetings of the Council with the TCCs, where on many occasions the level of participation and interaction is minimal, if not to say non-existent. We would like to hear the views of the TCCs on how those meetings could be more interactive, or if they believe that another form of dialogue would be more conducive to greater interaction.

My delegation would also like to call upon the host countries to take greater advantage of the Council's public meetings to refer to specific aspects of operations. It is also crucial that we all work together to improve the Council's interaction with the General Assembly, especially with the Special Committee on Peacekeeping Operations and the Fifth Committee.

Costa Rica is aware that some of our recommendations could prolong the Council's negotiations or increase its level of work. But we are also convinced that greater and more substantive interaction among all the actors would make it possible for the Council to take better decisions, to design clearer and more viable mandates and to guarantee more effective implementation of those decisions on the ground. Even more importantly, we believe that those proposals would help to strengthen trust between the different participants within a peacekeeping operation and would thus contribute to strengthening the partnerships that support and legitimize that emblematic activity of the United Nations.

I would like to thank Mr. Le Roy and Ms. Malcorra for their valuable statements and also for having circulated the executive summary of the New Horizon document and for having presented some of its main points in this debate. My delegation will await the final publication of the document to make constructive contributions to its recommendations. But we take this opportunity to briefly look at three points that were made in the document.

First, we agree with the important point that peacekeeping should be part of a political solution and, as we have argued on many occasions, on the need to be more creative in using the broad range of instruments that are available to the Council for the prevention and resolution of conflicts. For that reason, we look forward with interest to the recommendations along those lines. It would seem valuable to us if those could include specific proposals on current operations where those additional political tools could be deployed.

Secondly, we also hope to receive recommendations and proposals on strategies that could be used to mobilize coalitions of Member States and other partners to support peacekeeping operations, especially as we have seen the success of that approach in Haiti. It would be interesting if the document could provide specific cases of current operations where that type of strategy could be followed.

Thirdly, we agree with the urgency of building a consensus on policies to define the implementation of key mandates in peacekeeping operations, such as the protection of civilians. My country has in recent months been advocating in different forums the need to begin a process to define clear, realistic and appropriate guidelines and operational requirements for resources and training that make up the additional tasks related to the protection of civilians. For that reason, we await with interest the recommendations on this topic.

Lastly, Costa Rica will continue to work in a committed manner to promote close consultations among all partners involved in peacekeeping, bearing in mind at all times that our efforts will have a direct effect on the situations and lives of millions of civilians in armed conflict — the very raison d'être of peacekeeping operations.

Mr. Dabbashi (Libyan Arab Jamahiriya) (*spoke in Arabic*): First, I wish to thank you, Sir, for having organized this discussion on peacekeeping operations, which my country hopes will be an important link in the chain of reform of peacekeeping operations. We wish to thank Mr. Le Roy and Ms. Malcorra for their extremely useful briefings.

Since it was established, the United Nations has used peacekeeping operations as a tool to achieve peace and stability, alongside preventive diplomacy, mediation and peacebuilding. Peacekeeping operations have proven to be effective in many countries where they have insured security and stability, such as Cambodia, El Salvador, Guatemala and Mozambique.

Currently we are witnessing the ongoing success of certain peacekeeping operations, such as in Burundi and Sierra Leone. However, it must not be forgotten that some missions have failed miserably in building peace in time and to protect civilians. We have also witnessed unimaginable horrors such as those that occurred in Bosnia and Herzegovina, in Rwanda and in Somalia.

Despite the mixed results of peacekeeping operations, they are still the most appropriate tool for peacekeeping and for ensuring stability and preserving the lives of civilians. Nonetheless, the growing demand for peacekeeping operations and for their expansion and the growing costs have raised questions about their effectiveness and how best to manage and enhance them. How can we provide those operations with the necessary human and financial resources? Other questions concern the nature of their mandate, when and in what conditions we should resort to force and how best to fulfil their mandate to protect civilians.

Numerous efforts have been made to reform the planning and management of peacekeeping operations, from the Brahimi report (S/2000/809) to the 2010 reform agenda, the restructuring of the Department of Peacekeeping Operations and the establishment of the Department of Field Support. The work of the Special Committee on Peacekeeping Operations has ensured follow-up to and assessment of the reform. We look forward to receiving the non-paper on the New Horizon initiative on peacekeeping reform to be presented by the Secretariat, of which we have obtained an executive summary.

We hope that the debate that began in the Security Council on the United Kingdom/French initiative on the reform of peacekeeping operations will lead to concrete results through open debate in which all interested parties, including troop-contributing countries (TCCs) and police-contributing countries (PCCs), participate. There is no doubt that the participation of TCCs and PCCs is important in order to fill in the gaps in peacekeeping operations and to find ways to strengthen their effectiveness within the context of clear, agreed and verifiable mandates. We believe that it is high time to expand the corps of TCCs so that more of them will provide troops. That could be achieved through financial support to certain countries that are unable to provide troops, weapons and equipment.

The establishment or extension of any peacekeeping mandate must be in accordance with the purposes and principles of the United Nations Charter, agreed guidelines, the consent of the parties concerned, the non-use of force except in legitimate self-defence, and strict respect for the neutrality, sovereignty and territorial integrity of States, as well as non-interference in their internal affairs.

In that regard, we affirm the importance of all TCCS participating in all aspects and phases of peacekeeping. The growing need for peacekeeping operations requires more cooperation between the United Nations and relevant regional organizations, which must be encouraged to take part in peacebuilding and peacekeeping through regional mechanisms.

The African Union is the primary organization for two reasons. First, the majority of conflicts take place on the African continent. Secondly, the African Union has acquired special mechanisms for peacekeeping with the establishment of its Peace and Security Council, which is playing an increasingly important role in peacekeeping.

Furthermore, the African Union has launched initiatives that merit the support and encouragement of us all. We also support the implementation of a joint working programme between the African Union and the United Nations in order to strengthen the capabilities of the African Union's peacekeeping operations in the short and long terms, as well as those of its mission in Somalia. We welcome Mr. Le Roy's statement to that effect earlier in this meeting.

The success of peacekeeping operations depends on an active accompanying political process that includes the resolve of all parties to a conflict to repudiate violence and to favour a dialogue to restore peace. Peacekeeping must be part of all mandates, and

peacebuilding must also include support for strengthening and restructuring State institutions and the security sector, as well as the establishment of an effective police force, a robust legal system and the State's authority over its entire territory.

Ms. Rice (United States of America): We are grateful to Ambassador İlkin for convening this timely debate and for including troop- and police-contributing countries in the discussion. The United States deeply appreciates the chance to hear their views, and we salute the sacrifices made by their brave and women serving under the United Nations flag. Allow me also to thank Under-Secretaries-General Le Roy and Malcorra for their thorough briefings.

Much of what we have just heard echoes what key stakeholders say. United Nations peacekeeping operations save lives. They stop wars from escalating and spreading, and they can provide hope after decades of despair, as we have been told by the democratically elected leaders of such countries as Haiti, Liberia, Timor-Leste, Sierra Leone and Burundi.

However, for all the good that United Nations peacekeeping does, it faces, of course, serious challenges. Host Governments warn that violence may return if Blue Helmets leave too soon. Civilians plead for better protection from marauding gangs, rebel groups and renegade soldiers. Troop and police contributors point to a widening gap between the risks they face on the ground and the degree of input they have when mandates are discussed here in the Council. Financial contributors, in the throes of a global economic crisis, struggle to enforce budget discipline, cut waste and prevent abuse.

The Secretariat appeals for political support to advance peacemaking efforts and to assemble better equipped and rapidly deployable forces. Peacekeeping missions often need stronger leadership and endure persistent delays in acquiring critical personnel and materiel. And Security Council members question whether the way we produce mandates for those missions does justice to all those concerns and to the responsibilities that all of us on this Council must shoulder.

Those responsibilities do not end when we adopt a peacekeeping mandate. In many ways, it is where they begin. Tackling those challenges is one of my highest priorities, and the United States stands ready to do its part. Allow me to spell out five of the principles that will guide our approach.

First, we will seek mandates for United Nations peacekeeping operations that are credible and achievable. We will urge the Council to continue to weigh the full range of responses to a given challenge. Poorly armed and disorganized gangs, rebel groups and others outside a peace process should not be allowed to thwart a peacekeeping mandate or block a United Nations deployment. Peacekeepers are often authorized to use appropriate force to defend themselves and to fulfil their mandate, including protecting civilians under the imminent threat of violence. They must be willing and able to do so.

At the same time, we recognize that United Nations peacekeepers cannot do everything and go everywhere. There are limits to what they can accomplish, especially in the midst of a full-blown war or in the face of opposition from the host Government.

Peacekeeping missions are not always the right answer; some situations require other types of United Nations-authorized military deployments, such as regional efforts or multinational forces operating under the framework of a lead nation. Effective mediation must precede, as well as accompany, peacekeeping efforts if they are to succeed.

Those lessons have guided our approach in a number of instances, most recently in Somalia, where conditions are not yet appropriate for successful United Nations peacekeeping. But that is a country that still urgently needs sustained, if not increased, international support.

Secondly, the United States will intensify diplomatic efforts to give new momentum to some of the stalled or faltering peace processes in areas where United Nations peacekeeping operations are deployed, starting with Darfur and the Sudan's North-South peace process. As the Council is aware, President Obama appointed General Scott Gration as his special envoy for the Sudan for precisely that purpose. Successful diplomatic and political efforts are crucial to enabling the African Union-United Nations Hybrid Operation in Darfur (UNAMID), the United Nations Mission in Somalia and the United Nations Mission in Chad and Central African Republic (MINURCAT) to better implement their mandates.

Thirdly, the United States will strengthen its efforts with the United Nations and other partners to expand the pool of troop and police contributors for both current and future United Nations peacekeeping

operations. That will require work on several fronts. The United States, for its part, is willing to consider directly contributing more military observers, military staff officers, civilian police and other civilian personnel, including more women, to United Nations peacekeeping operations. We will also explore ways to provide enabling assistance to peacekeeping missions, either by ourselves or together with partners.

Let me single out one immediate priority. We will assist with generating the missing forces in enabling units required for UNAMID, MINURCAT and the United Nations Organization Mission in the Democratic Republic of the Congo to better protect civilians under imminent threat of physical harm, including sexual violence.

We will be open-minded about practical suggestions to deepen consultations among troop and police contributors, the Security Council and the Secretariat, including redoubling efforts to implement undertakings in resolutions 1327 (2000) and 1353 (2001). In those consultations, we should also be clear about what we are asking of troop contributors and what we are willing to do to assist them.

We will provide improved training and equipment assistance through the United States Global Peace Operations Initiative and its Africa-oriented programme, the African Contingency Operations Training and Assistance programme. Through the Global Peace Operations Initiative, the United States has already trained 75,000 peacekeepers and facilitated the deployment of some 49,000 peacekeepers to 20 operations around the world, mostly in Africa. Over the next five years, the Global Peace Operations Initiative will continue direct training, but will make it its top priority to help partner countries to become self-sufficient in peacekeeping training.

The United States will engage in longer-term discussions about how best to increase the interoperability and supply of rapidly deployable brigade-size forces — the very forces that could join, reinforce and buy time for United Nations peacekeeping operations in an hour of crisis. And the United States will consider different ways to support the increasing need for effective formed police units.

Fourthly, the United States will dedicate greater attention to Security Council discussions on the renewal of existing peacekeeping mandates. We will seek more comprehensive assessments of the progress that has been made and the obstacles that remain. That includes carefully considering the early-recovery and peacebuilding activities that enable peacekeeping operations to depart successfully, such as demobilizing and reintegrating former combatants, reforming the security sector and strengthening the rule of law.

We will use these discussions as opportunities to take stock of the ways that United States assistance can accelerate the transfer of responsibilities from peacekeepers to the host country in success. We plan to start this new approach in September, when the Security Council is scheduled to discuss Liberia and Haiti. But let me be clear: We will not support arbitrary or abrupt efforts to downsize or terminate missions before their downsizing or termination is warranted.

Finally, the United States will carefully review and keep an open mind about reform proposals from the Secretariat and others, especially those to be contained in the New Horizon non-paper and related field-support proposals, in order to address the many challenges we have discussed today.

We are ready to work together with members of the Council, the Secretariat, the countries that provide troops and police, and the many other partners on whose efforts success in peacekeeping depends, notably the countries in which United Nations peacekeeping operations now exist or may be deployed in the future. We thank our colleagues, in particular the United Kingdom, France, Japan, Turkey, Canada and Nigeria, for urging us to confront the challenges facing United Nations peacekeeping. We thank the peacekeepers and those who support them for all their efforts and courage. We look forward to the lifesaving work we can continue to do together.

Mr. Dolgov (Russian Federation) (*spoke in Russian*): We are grateful to you, Mr. President, and to the Turkish delegation for organizing today's meeting on the topical issue of peacekeeping operations. We have listened with great interest to the statements by Under-Secretaries-General Le Roy and Ms. Malcorra.

The increase in the number of peacekeeping operations, the rise in the number of staff involved in them, and the growing complexity of their peacekeeping mandates — all against the backdrop of a shortage of financial and technical resources — are conditions of contemporary United Nations peacekeeping and the development of comprehensive planning and implementation strategies. We believe that any steps to

reform peacekeeping should be geared towards enhancing the effectiveness of United Nations operations. It is truly important that they be carried out in accordance with the Charter of the United Nations and the norms of international law, including international humanitarian law; in full respect for the primary responsibility of the Security Council for the maintenance of international peace and security; and in line with universally recognized principles of peacekeeping.

We see opportunities for the improvement of United Nations peacekeeping primarily in the areas of operationalization, more effective use of the resources of regional organizations and the growing potential of the United Nations itself in all crucial areas of peacekeeping and peacebuilding. Of course, mandates must be very clear, implementable and appropriate to a situation.

We call for continued improvement in consultations between members of the Security Council, troop-contributing countries and other contributors to peacekeeping, as well as with the Secretariat, on all matters related to peacekeeping activities, including at the level of planning. We should make maximum use of the procedures already in place and of previous Security Council decisions. We believe that, in order to organize such dialogue, we must make even fuller use of the Council's Working Group on Peacekeeping Operations. In that connection, we acknowledge the efforts of Japan as Chair of the Group.

We call on troop-contributing countries to more actively utilize the dialogue format already in place so as to keep members of the Security Council and the Secretariat fully informed of their assessments of operations under way. We have often said that dialogue with troop contributors should be a path for genuine two-way communication.

The Security Council has a very special responsibility for drawing up realistic mandates for peacekeeping operations. We believe that the decisions of the Council to create peacekeeping operations should be based on prior agreements with potential troop contributors with the aim of ensuring full staffing of the missions and their speedy deployment. Given the increasing complexity and multifunctionality of contemporary peacekeeping mandates, it is particularly important to clearly define functions in connection with peacekeeping and in post-conflict peacebuilding. We believe that United Nations peacekeeping forces should be involved only in the initial stages of reconstruction, while we should involve more actively in United Nations peacebuilding and socio-economic reform those bodies that deal with such subjects, for example the Peacebuilding Commission, regional organizations, international financial institutions and bilateral donors.

We should give special attention to the problem of ensuring that the necessary level of military expertise is available to the Security Council, which I must say that it is still unsatisfactory. We support the idea of involving military experts from Council members' delegations in reaching agreement on and reviewing the mandates of peacekeeping operations. We also think that the Security Council should work more systemically on the military aspects of peacekeeping.

The Russian proposal that the Military Staff Committee be made more active and have all 15 Council members represented in it is still on the table, and we hope it will be welcomed. We are convinced that an assessment by the Military Staff Committee of the military situation in countries where peacekeeping operations are deployed, recommendations from the Committee on operational aspects of peacekeeping and its participation in missions to determine the level of readiness of peacekeeping contingents and infrastructure would provide the Council with reliable and timely information. Such an approach would strengthen the military expertise of United Nations peacekeeping as a whole.

We stress the responsibility of the Secretariat in improving the comprehensive planning of operations and coordination between Headquarters and the field. In the context of the recent restructuring of the Department of Peacekeeping Operations and the Department of Field Support, the strengthening of the Office of Military Affairs and the establishment of an Office of Rule of Law and Security Institutions, we believe that the Secretariat is fully capable of carrying out this work effectively.

Additional attention could be given to improving the day-to-day coordination of the activities of all of these Secretariat structures. Achieving a systemic approach will be possible only if there is a rational distribution of powers and responsibilities among the various departments and offices of the Secretariat, while preserving the unity of command and control.

This is particularly relevant today in the light of the deployment of the United Nations operations in Darfur, Chad and the Central African Republic.

It is important to develop criteria for adjusting mandates and drawing down peacekeeping operations. To that end, it must be recalled that the main purpose of peacekeeping is establishing conditions for a successful political process. This is the key principle in the Council's adoption of decisions in this area. In that context, I fully agree with the statement made today by Ambassador Rice of the United States of America to the effect that it is unadvisable and counterproductive to wind operations down too early. We believe that this approach is of key importance and that it should be applied to all United Nations peacekeeping operations, without exception.

Experience has shown that more active resort to regional organizations is effective, provided that their activities are carried out in accordance with the purposes and principles of the Charter and that their relations with the United Nations, and the Council in particular, are governed by the provisions of Chapter VIII of the Charter. Along with such traditional partners as the African Union and the European Union, the United Nations could strengthen its relations with other regional structures, many of which have quite a bit of experience, for example in mediation and the peaceful settlement of disputes. We feel that there are good prospects for cooperation between the United Nations and such well-tested organizations as the Shanghai Cooperation Organization and the Collective Security Treaty Organization.

Given the complex tasks and challenges facing United Nations peacekeeping, we look forward to the forthcoming New Horizon report to be issued by the Secretariat, which was presented today by Mr. Le Roy and Ms. Malcorra. The report will be a valuable contribution to the work of reforming peacekeeping mechanisms of the United Nations to make them more effective. The report will clearly require very careful study.

It is important to ensure optimal coordination between the work of the Secretariat with the relevant work of the Council and the General Assembly. The Russian Federation attaches great importance to the role of United Nations peacekeeping activities in the maintenance of international peace and security, and we intend to increase our participation in peacekeeping operations. Russian peacekeepers are deployed in the Middle East, various parts of Africa, Haiti and Kosovo. There is a Russian helicopter unit in the United Nations Mission in the Sudan and another Russian airborne unit in the United Nations Mission in the Central African Republic and Chad. The training of African specialists of the All-Russia Institute of Advanced Training for Workers in the Russian Ministry of Internal Affairs is important and useful work. We are willing to cooperate in such relevant activities with all interested delegations and the Secretariat.

Mr. Hoang Chi Trung (Viet Nam): First of all, I wish to thank you, Mr. President, for convening this important debate. I thank Mr. Alain Le Roy, Under-Secretary-General for Peacekeeping Operations, and Ms. Susana Malcorra, Under-Secretary-General for Field Support, for their presentations and introduction of some preliminary findings and proposals under the New Horizon initiative for United Nations peacekeeping.

Peacekeeping operations have beyond a doubt established a niche role in the spectrum of options available for the maintenance of international peace and security. Together with other collective efforts to assist countries emerging from conflict to achieve a steady state of stability, peacekeeping has proven to be a versatile tool and a credible mechanism to deter or reverse conflicts and has accumulated a good track record of legitimacy when deployed appropriately.

Since the beginning of the new millennium, however, contemporary peacekeeping has faced one of the most critical moments in its history as a result of the evolving demands for complex and multidimensional mandates, the sheer overstretch of authorized troop and police availability and capability, the changing nature of conflicts and the increasingly unpredictable security environment for peacekeepers.

With an annual budget of well over $8 billion and the mounting pressures of the global financial crisis, peacekeeping missions have had to shoulder a daunting agenda of deploying at a rapid pace into remote areas, maintaining economies of scale, laying the groundwork for sustainable peace dividends and ensuring achievable mandates with clear benchmarks and within specific timelines.

In the meantime, the unsustainable equilibrium between costs and capacities that vary across operations continues to expose looming gaps among

those who take decisions on peacekeeping operations, those who implement them, those who allocate resources, those who have to implement decisions on the ground and the recipient countries.

Sharpening the peacekeeping tool to make it more effective and successful is a continuous process of the Organization. The non-paper on the New Horizon initiative to be formally introduced by the Secretariat should receive thorough consideration by the Security Council and the broader United Nations membership, as well as other stakeholders in peacekeeping activities, in order to enable us to draw good lessons and to make peacekeeping ever more effective in the interests of international peace and security.

The challenges emanating from the expansion and complexity of today's peacekeeping make it necessary to review existing practices and formulate a comprehensive strategy that cuts across the whole range of activities from the design of concepts and policies to proper and comprehensive planning; from objective analysis of ground realities to the formulation of clear, realistic and achievable mandates and the provision of commensurate resources; from ensuring the safety and security of personnel to integrated command and control; and from the implementation of mandates to sound drawdown and exit strategies.

Against that backdrop, since the launch of the Brahimi report (S/2000/809) nine years ago, the Secretariat has undertaken a number of initiatives to enhance the effectiveness, impact and efficiency of peacekeeping operations. A good number of efforts are also under way among the various bodies involved in the decision-making process, such as the Fifth Committee, the Special Committee on Peacekeeping Operations, the Peacebuilding Commission, United Nations agencies and programmes, and the Working Group on Peacekeeping Operations.

It is therefore fundamental to decisively improve the coordination of these efforts so as to avoid the duplication of resources, share best practices and maximize complementary distributions of responsibilities. In so doing, the exercise of mandates and reforms on the peacekeeping track should be carried out in accordance with the purposes and principles of the United Nations Charter and universally recognized guidelines, namely, the consent of the parties, the non-use of force except in self-defence, total impartiality, respect for the sovereignty and territorial integrity of States, and non-interference in their internal affairs.

The entire United Nations membership and international partners can have a role to play in helping to alleviate the manifold burdens and tackle the varied obstacles confronting peacekeeping. Troop-contributing countries (TCCs) and police-contributing countries (PCCs), most of which are non-aligned and developing countries and bear the overwhelming majority of human and material costs of missions, should be involved early and fully in the preparation, planning, monitoring, conduct and evaluation of peacekeeping operations so that their operational experience and intellectual input can contribute to the appropriate, effective and timely decision-making and policy-formulating process both at Headquarters and in the field.

It is henceforth crucial to strengthen the triangular communication among TCCs and PCCs, the Security Council and the Secretariat, as laid out in resolution 1353 (2001) and the note by the President of the Security Council contained in document S/2002/56. Cooperation between the Organization and regional and subregional organizations may have added value if it helps us to fully comprehend the nature of the situation and enables missions to achieve their intended objectives, provided that those relationships are regulated on the basis of Chapter VIII of the Charter.

Given the specific limits and comparative advantages that they possess, peacekeeping operations should not be considered to be panaceas for the definitive settlements of conflicts, which can be achieved only by addressing the comprehensive political, security, economic and humanitarian dimensions of a given problem.

Experience has shown that, when operations are deployed in inappropriate circumstances, the results can be disastrous for the population in the conflict area, for the peacekeepers themselves and even for the viability of the instrument of peacekeeping. Conversely, an in-depth understanding of the specific country setting, the sequenced application of the right tools in response to the underlying conflict dynamics, and the early synchronization of steps leading towards a more normalized situation are the best guarantors of a smooth, gradual transition to early recovery and the best deterrence against the risks incurred by peacekeepers.

In the final analysis, finding a lasting solution to a conflict requires us to go beyond military and security measures, incorporating broader and more effective long-term responses that address the root causes of the conflict and promote national ownership of and contribution to future stability. It is in this context that the Organization's potential on parallel tracks should be further strengthened, above all in the areas of preventive diplomacy, conflict prevention, mediation, peacemaking and peacebuilding.

Mr. Vilović (Croatia): First of all, I would like to thank the Turkish presidency of the Security Council for convening this important debate on an issue of special importance to Security Council members and the general membership alike. No other issue considered by the United Nations brings together so many branches of its everyday work, which has naturally kept it in the focus of this body for many years.

I would also like to thank Under-Secretaries-General Alain Le Roy and Susana Malcorra for their valuable presentations today. I also express our appreciation for the initiative of the United Kingdom and France in that field and for the steady work of the Security Council Working Group on Peacekeeping Operations, under its Japanese chairmanship.

We are not saying anything innovative when we affirm that the international landscape has changed sharply over the past 20 years, and with it the nature of contemporary conflict. Traditional peacekeeping as we have known it has also gone through transformations and reincarnations, and is nowadays becoming increasingly robust and multidimensional in its approach. Peacekeeping missions are moving away from — if I may put it this way — the old way of thinking that involved separating forces and monitoring ceasefires, and are increasingly being tasked with rebuilding societies from the ground up. That is a reality, and we commend both the Department of Peacekeeping Operations (DPKO) and the Department of Field Support (DFS) for factoring this new reality into their organizational and operational preparations.

Cognizant of this new reality on the ground and of the need to strengthen unity and cohesion amongst all stakeholders in order to make the future of peacekeeping as successful as possible, especially in the light of the challenges we are facing, we should like to highlight some issues that we feel need further attention.

Whenever we approach the question of contemporary peacekeeping in a holistic manner, it would be remiss not to mention the Brahimi report (S/2000/809) and other United Nations documents that have followed, including the recently distributed executive brief contained in the DPKO/DFS New Horizon non-paper. We support the guidelines provided in these documents, especially given the fact that the United Nations acts under the premise that conflict cannot be resolved first and foremost by military and seeks rather to address problems through their root causes.

Croatia fully supports the notion that lasting peace and security can be built only through adherence to the three interlinked and firmly grounded basic pillars of security, development and the protection of human rights. That having been said, it should also be stressed that there is no one-size-fits-all peacekeeping operation: each new mission needs to be tailored to the concrete conditions and to the political realities on the ground. A clear political strategy and integrated mission planning are extremely important to that end and should include the provision of a precisely defined mandate with clear and achievable benchmarks and goals and with a clear exit strategy.

As stated, Croatia believes that the most promising approach to peacekeeping operations is an integrated and comprehensive one that brings together the various United Nations departments and agencies in working towards a common goal. The contemporary role of peacekeeping is not only to re-establish and provide continued security in the area of operation; ultimately operations are there to enable Governments and societies to resolve their own problems in a self-sufficient manner, so that the role of the international community can gradually be reduced to that of an adviser. Local ownership should be the overarching demand of both the host country and the international community. That, of course, also includes the development of local security forces, the importance of which we have seen first-hand during Security Council visits to a number of countries.

That having been said, development is of crucial importance for the long-term success of peacekeeping operations. If the foundations of future prosperity are not built into the mandates of peacekeeping operations

from the beginning — and by this we mean long-term issues such as the protection of civilians, the strengthening of civil society, security sector reform, including the strengthening of police and judicial forces, and economic revitalization and development — repeated recourse to violence can be and quite often is probable. Croatia has paid a great deal of attention to these issues and has, in fact, deployed some civil-sector experts to places such as Iraq and Afghanistan.

Croatia considers the training and education of peacekeeping personnel to be another key aspect of the eventual success of any peacekeeping operation. Since 2001, Croatia has conducted education and pre-deployment training of Croatian and foreign officers at the United Nations-certified International Military Operations Training Centre near Zagreb, while since 2006 a similar international course has been regularly organized for United Nations police officers. That latter course has been certified by the United Nations since 2008.

Croatia particularly supports all the proposals aimed at greater coordination and strengthened relations between the Security Council and troop- and police-contributing countries (TCCs and PCCs). That aspect is crucial, as TCCs and PCCs must have confidence that their contribution will be fully appreciated and that conditions will be created for them to fully express their respective interests. It is clearly counterproductive to plan a peacekeeping operation without the unambiguous support of a core number of nations willing to provide troops for the proposed mission.

Croatia also believes that, in order to share the burden imposed by peacekeeping, the United Nations should strengthen its cooperation with regional organizations and improve cooperation between United Nations agencies and other international agencies active on the ground. Since the majority of United Nations peacekeeping takes place in Africa, we believe that cooperation between the United Nations and the African Union and the Economic Community of West African States is particular important.

Before concluding, we would like to highlight one final issue, especially in the light of the ever-increasing burdens, both financial and logistical, being placed on United Nations peacekeeping and its troop-contributors. Much has been written and discussed regarding the issue of multidimensional versus traditional peacekeeping, but little work has been done on the possibility of promoting the idea of preventive peacekeeping. We have one concrete example: that of the United Nations Preventive Deployment Force (UNPREDEP) in Macedonia, which proved to be very successful in defusing a tense political and military situation and in preventing the outbreak of violent conflict. We need to ask ourselves the perennial questions of whether prevention is better than cure and how much we can potentially save — foremost in lives, but also in financial and logistical resources — if we act pre-emptively in situations that have the potential to seriously challenge international peace and security.

The President: I shall now make a statement in my national capacity.

Let me start by thanking Under-Secretaries-General Le Roy and Malcorra for their briefings, which have set the right tone for our debate. The interventions by Council members have also touched upon all relevant points, so I will confine myself to four basic questions we face in dealing with the challenges of peacekeeping.

First, why do we need peacekeeping? Since its inception, peacekeeping has become one of the key tools of the United Nations for the maintenance of global peace and security and has proved its versatility in a number of cases by helping to deter or reverse inter-State conflicts, ending civil wars and mitigating humanitarian crises.

Of course, it is far preferable to prevent conflicts before they become full-fledged crises requiring intensive peacekeeping or peacemaking. And for that, there is no doubt that we need to invest more in the international community's mediation and conflict prevention capabilities. However, in the real world we all know too well that the need for United Nations peacekeeping operations will never cease to exist. And thus, in parallel with efforts to improve our practices on when and how best to mandate peacekeeping missions, we must also make sure that the necessary political will and capabilities are in place.

The second question is: What are the problems? Today, international peacekeeping operations face a series of problems and challenges including military, financial and personnel overstretch. As the largest institutional provider of peacekeepers worldwide, the United Nations feels these difficulties more than any other organization.

In addition to the dwindling of financial resources available to peacekeeping activities, perhaps more important is the fact that the pool of troops to which we all resort also shows quantitative and logistical deficiencies. The troop-contributing countries are facing increasing difficulties in providing the necessary troops and capabilities.

The third question is: What are the causes of these problems? The causes of the current problems in United Nations peacekeeping are to be found both at the strategic-political level and at the operational-implementation level. Incomplete reforms, strains in management and command systems, disproportionality between mandates and resources and problems of scale all hamper the efficiency of peacekeeping operations.

For instance, peacekeeping operations are now frequently mandated to protect civilians. But often, they do not have the size or density of forces to do so. Likewise, benchmarking of progress is a key determinant in an exit strategy. But in actuality, identifying the conditions for exit poses a serious challenge.

The indispensable link between the political process and the peacekeeping is yet another important aspect of the problems faced. The disconnect between those who mandate and those who implement and the lack of effective and dynamic supervision by the Council over all peacekeeping operations are other factors which in varying degrees add to the complexity of the problems faced. What is more, the Department of Peacekeeping Operations and the Department of Field Support are understaffed.

The fourth and final question is: How can we overcome these problems and what should be the way ahead? We definitely need a compass setting out the agreed and achievable goals and a collective determination for the future direction of United Nations peacekeeping. Implementing reforms, generating resources, building up the necessary capabilities and developing effective partnership among all stakeholders, as well as improving interoperability, turn out to be the essential elements in this regard.

More rapid and more flexible peacekeeping operations require institutional and operational reforms to United Nations command and control mechanisms, procurement and supply systems and the overall strategy. We believe that the two central tenets of the Brahimi report (S/2000/809) should be our guide: deployment of forces should be tied to a viable political strategy and mandates should be linked to the reality of available resources.

Enhancing the deterrent power of peacekeeping forces by providing them with sufficient assets, establishing close cooperation between the civilian and military parts of a mission, strengthening early warning mechanisms in possible crisis regions, integrating the political and socio-economic dimensions of peacebuilding into peace support operations and enhancing cooperation with regional security organizations such as the African Union, the European Union and the Organization for Security and Cooperation in Europe would all add to the efficient operation of peacekeeping missions in the field. Capacity-building and the training of peacekeepers also constitute an indispensable component of conducting a successful peacekeeping operation.

In short, to meet the challenges before us, we need a new coalition, a strategic dialogue that will include all stakeholders, particularly the Security Council, the Secretariat, the United Nations Special Committee on Peacekeeping Operations, the Fifth Committee, the Peacebuilding Commission and in some cases the Office for the Coordination of Humanitarian Affairs, as well as troop- and police-contributing countries (TCCs and PCCs). The new agenda for partnership as described by Under-Secretaries-General Le Roy and Malcorra is thus essential. In particular, earlier and more substantive consultations by the Security Council with troop and police contributors would be of significant importance, since enhanced cooperation would enable the design of mandates based on a clear picture of available troops and police, and thus could provide realistic options for what can and cannot be achieved. As a result, mandates would have earlier and wider acceptance from troop contributors, and benchmarking would be easier.

Given the operational and political risks that United Nations peacekeepers face in tough environments, it is natural that the troop- and police-contributing countries want an increased say in how operations are run. There have been a number of experiments on how to include TCCs and PCCs more effectively in monitoring and sustaining missions. Building on these examples and experiences, we could — and we should — look for a more concrete and regular process of dialogue with the TCCs and

PCCs. As a dedicated troop- and police-contributing country, Turkey has a keen interest in strengthening the viability, sustainability and effectiveness of United Nations peacekeeping and will continue to maintain its commitment to that end.

In conclusion, despite the scale and complexity of the challenges facing United Nations peace operations, we believe that this is not a moment for despair. Indeed, times of crisis carry with them opportunities for reform and progress. And it is encouraging to see that there is a true willingness and a strong desire for fresh ideas, both in the Secretariat and among Member States, for reviewing and reforming how the United Nations system responds to conflicts. The challenge now is to translate this will into concrete steps and reforms.

I now resume my functions as President of the Security Council.

I give the floor to the representative of Canada.

Mr. McNee (Canada): I would like to thank you, Mr. President, and the Mission of Turkey for organizing this important and timely debate. I would also like to thank Under-Secretaries-General Le Roy and Malcorra for their presentations today, and for the considered thought and analysis they have given to the challenges facing peacekeeping and how to meet those challenges.

For a decade or more, thoughtful observers have lamented the strains on United Nations peacekeeping and proposed solutions, modest or grand. Much of the relevant machinery has been overhauled; significant progress has been made. The time since the Brahimi report (S/2000/809) has not been wasted, and most important, the changes have helped the United Nations to save lives.

The core logic of Lakhdar Brahimi and his colleagues still obtains: United Nations missions are no substitute for resolute effort by the international community to seek and safeguard peace. Yet the Brahimi principles have to be complemented by concrete actions aimed at renewing the strategic partnership among core peacekeeping partners: namely, those who decide — that is, the Council; those who pay — the financial contributors; those who do — the troop- and police-contributors; and the Secretariat and regional organizations. And the wider support of the membership of the General Assembly is important as well.

Indeed, much remains to be done. The present renewed attention to peacekeeping is, in part, a reflection of how much the circumstances of United Nations peace operations have changed since 1999. In this context, an intensive, inclusive consultation process with Member States and partner organizations is necessary. Canada welcomes a dialogue aimed at reaching a common understanding of the critical aspects of peacekeeping, as outlined in the summary paper presented today.

As members of the Council know, Canada recently launched an informal thematic series with the aim of bringing together all the major actors in peacekeeping to discuss the main challenges that are at the heart of the New Horizon project. Our aim is to complement the other important work now under way — by Japan, as Chair of the Security Council Working Group, by the United Kingdom and France and, of course, by the Secretariat. Over the course of the fall and winter, Canada will host a series of follow-up events designed to dig deeper into issues of strategic significance to the future of United Nations peacekeeping — specifically, on mandates and modalities, on the political dimension and on resources. We believe these three baskets of issues are at the heart of any effort to update and renew broad-based support for United Nations actions. Canada very much supports the non-paper's comprehensive coverage of this terrain, with a view to enhancing credibility, capacity and cohesion.

Let me just say a few words about these three strategic challenges from a Canadian perspective. First, on mandates and modalities, we all know that the Security Council is deploying missions in response to a wider, more complex array of challenges than at any point in its history. In the most difficult environments, such as in the Democratic Republic of the Congo and Darfur, the effectiveness and credibility of United Nations operations are limited by a mismatch between mandates and resources. Alleviating this gap requires a means of sustaining support among the Council, troop- and police- contributors, the Secretariat and the host Government. It also requires improved capacity for strategic planning and designing mandates and revisiting the Brahimi panel's recommendation on a two-phase approach to mandate making, in order to

design implementable mandates, including robust tasks such as the protection of civilians.

The second challenge lies in the political dimension. It is often said that peacekeeping cannot substitute for effective peacemaking. However, peacekeeping missions have often been called upon to do exactly that. As we look at the future of United Nations missions, it is essential that greater attention be paid to the political dimensions: peacemaking, conflict prevention, peacekeeping and peacebuilding. Accomplishing this will mean integrating the New Horizon initiative with the recently released reports of the Secretary-General on mediation and on early recovery, recognizing the critical relationship between peacebuilding and peacekeeping and enhancing cooperation between the Security Council and the Peacebuilding Commission. But, above all, a renewed commitment by the Council to sustain its political engagement in countries on its agenda would assist in ensuring that fragile political settlements are not derailed by local or regional disputes.

The final challenge is resourcing. Ensuring appropriate human, financial and material resources and recognizing the growing role of regional organizations and arrangements in implementing mandates are vital to the continued success of United Nations missions. Reforms inspired by the Brahimi report have helped, but the process has stalled. The Department of Field Support strategic support plan offers innovative first steps in logistics, procurement and human resources that Canada views as necessary for today's operations.

In conclusion, there are clearly no easy answers. But with sustained and serious effort by the Secretariat, the Council, the Special Committee on Peacekeeping Operations and the membership as a whole, Canada believes it is possible to renew and indeed strengthen the ability of the United Nations to meet contemporary challenges to peace and security. Canada stands ready to support this effort.

The President: I now give the floor to the representative of Nigeria.

Mrs. Ogwu (Nigeria): I extend the deep gratitude of the Nigerian delegation to you, Mr. President, for the invitation to participate in this meeting and for the concise concept note provided to facilitate the discussion. This initiative is greatly appreciated not only for its value as a stock-taking endeavour, but also because it strengthens the current momentum in reviewing United Nations peacekeeping strategies. We thank Mr. Alain Le Roy, Under-Secretary-General for Peacekeeping Operations, and Ms. Susanna Malcorra, Under-Secretary-General for Field Support, for their insightful and informative statements today.

In our time, reform of United Nations peacekeeping has become inevitable given the rapid expansion, complexity and multidimensional scope of peacekeeping and humanitarian relief missions. Several missions are constrained by lack of basic equipment, transport, food and medical supplies. This situation is compounded by gaps between mandates, inadequate planning of operations, fluid exit strategies and perhaps imprecise relationships between troop-contributing countries (TCCs), the Secretariat and the Security Council.

The Nigerian delegation believes that as formidable as these challenges are, they do not in any way diminish the relevance of United Nations peacekeeping as an essential instrument for conflict resolution and peacemaking. We also believe that Member States need to forge a consensus on the strategies for addressing these challenges, particularly the relationship between TCCs, the Secretariat and the Security Council. Consensus is required especially on issues of mandate, resources, entry into peace operations, exit benchmarking and strategic long-term planning.

Considering the relationship between TCCs and the Security Council, we note that the broader and more sustained dialogue envisaged by resolutions 1327 (2000) and 1353 (2001) has not been fully realized. Undergirding this situation is the urgent need for strengthening the triangular cooperation between the Security Council, the TCCs and the Secretariat. It is imperative that TCCs that implement peacekeeping mandates in the field are involved from the conception and resolution-drafting stages of a peacekeeping operation through to its deployment and final exit.

Resource constraints remain the single most important challenge to effective peacekeeping. This dampens the morale and enthusiasm of peacekeepers and the political will of TCCs. Therefore, resources must be adequate and predictable in order to accomplish the mandated tasks. Furthermore, adequate predeployment training should be a prerequisite to the successful implementation of any mandate.

There should be a larger consensus-building process encompassing political negotiations at the highest levels of Member States on the difficult issues of doctrine, entry, exit, rapid deployment, resources and Security Council working methods. Nigeria supports intensified dialogue and consultations between the Fifth Committee of the General Assembly, the Peacebuilding Commission, the Special Committee on Peacekeeping Operations and the Security Council Working Group on Peacekeeping Operations in order to overcome some of the clearly delineated challenges facing United Nations peacekeeping operations.

The President: I give the floor to the representative of Italy, who will be the last speaker for the morning session.

Mr. Terzi di Sant'Agata (Italy): Allow me to take this opportunity to express my sincere appreciation to you, Ambassador İlkin, for the invitation to take the floor this morning, and especially for taking the initiative to convene this extremely important debate on peacekeeping. I would also like to express my sincere appreciation to Under-Secretaries-General Le Roy and Malcorra for their thorough briefings, and I would also like to note that their remarks have been extremely helpful in setting the whole tone of our debate and that their leadership in United Nations peacekeeping operations has been extremely helpful as well.

In taking the floor today, I wish first of all to endorse the statement that the representative of the Czech Republic will make on behalf of the European Union in his country's capacity as President of the Union.

Today's debate allows us to focus on how to further strengthen the effectiveness of United Nations peacekeeping and to ensure an efficient use of resources. The Security Council, the General Assembly and the Secretariat have all undertaken important initiatives, while research institutes and internationally recognized experts are also contributing to shaping our shared views and our proposals.

The discussion to date now has proven once again the priority that Member States attach to this effort of improving our peacekeeping operations and structuring our peacekeeping potential. All of this is also very clear in the references that have been made to the New Horizon project.

My Government believes that the Secretary-General should indeed be encouraged in the direction of pursuing reforms aimed at strengthening the Secretariat and making it more efficient. Given the growing interconnection between peacekeeping and peacebuilding, a standing rule of law capacity could be favourably considered based on the model of the standing police capacity, whose transfer to the Brindisi Logistics Base as a permanent operative centre for a genuine United Nations police force will be a first strategic step in the crucial development of the rapid response capacity of the United Nations.

With almost 9,000 men and women deployed on United Nations-led or -authorized missions, my country is a top contributor to United Nations peacekeeping operations. It is a top contributor among European and the Group of Eight (G-8) countries and is one of the top 10 of all contributors to United Nations peacekeeping operations. It hosts and actively supports a number of programme initiatives and infrastructure facilities, among which I would like to mention the United Nations Logistics Base.

We also hold training programmes and make other forms of contributions. I would like to mention that an event dedicated to children in armed conflict attended by Foreign Minister Frattini, Rome's Mayor Alemanno, Under-Secretary-General Koomaraswamy and other participants was held last Tuesday in Rome. There we proposed a joint training programme together with the Department of Peacekeeping Operations (DPKO) for the protection of children as part of peacekeeping mandates. We sincerely hope that this new programme called "See the Light" will come to fruition in future months.

There is a need for greater coordination between the Security Council and countries that provide troops and financial resources. As soon as a mandate is defined, those who are called upon to operate on the ground must be fully involved. While the fundamental responsibility to decide mandates and objectives of a mission belongs to the Security Council, the definition of tasks, resources and concepts of operation must also take into account the expertise of countries that provide troops and essential resources. As has been stated repeatedly during our debate, the Brahimi report (S/2000/809) recommended a two-step definition of mandates: first, identifying objectives; and secondly, defining jointly with contributing countries the

operative details. This is an idea that we should again consider in the framework of the New Horizon project.

Cooperation between the United Nations and regional organizations is another very fundamental aspect. The experience of the European Union in Chad, for example, taught us that a shared strategy can be successfully implemented even in a very complex transition.

The wide majority of peacekeeping missions take place in Africa, and therefore a shared vision between the United Nations and the African Union is needed. Regional dimension and ownership must be supported and encouraged. Much has been done in that area. The United Nations-African Union panel that was established months ago has made several important recommendations that could be pragmatically implemented. For example, for missions led by the African Union under the aegis of the United Nations, we should contribute to crisis management capacity, to sustainability in all aspects and to more adequate financial support. In particular, we could accomplish that through greater certainty and predictability of resources and better coordination among decision-making bodies, both at the level of the United Nations and the level of the regional organizations.

As president of the Group of Eight (G-8), my country is presently focusing on aspects of peacekeeping. We have been actively engaged in fulfilling the commitments taken by the G-8 leaders at Sea Island and Hokkaido to strengthen peacekeeping capacities and structures, in particular in African countries, in support of the principle of national ownership. A report will promptly be made available along the lines anticipated by the declaration adopted in Trieste last Friday by the G-8 Ministers for Foreign Affairs, stressing the development of police components, the promotion of rule of law and training.

In that framework, I would also like to mention the Center of Excellence for Stability Police Units in Vicenza, which was established by the G-8 countries. It has trained 2,500 officers in only four years, 1,000 of whom are from Africa. The Center is increasingly active in cooperating with the United Nations.

As a global organization, the United Nations needs an efficient and flexible logistics structure that would ensure economies of scale and rational use of resources. The United Nations Logistics Base, whose strengthening Italy has constantly supported, appears to be a key element for improving logistics support both at the global and regional levels. Within that logic, my Government supports proposals that could strengthen African capacity-building efforts, including through regional hubs.

The President: There are still a number of speakers remaining on my list for this meeting. I intend, with the concurrence of the members of the Council, to suspend the meeting until 3 p.m.

The meeting was suspended at 1.15 p.m.